CHARACTERISTICS OF SELECTED FLORIDA ADULT EDUCATION LEADERS AND ADMINISTRATORS

By

BEVERLY McMURTRY GRISSOM

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

1994

Copyright 1994

by

Beverly McMurtry Grissom

The support and encouragement of my family have made completion of this study possible, and public recognition here is appropriate and well deserved.

Foremost, to my extraordinary daughter, Tammaye Vanece Grissom, I extend my unqualified love and gratitude for her continuous support, her abiding love and patience, and her gracious acceptance of growing up with a mother who has been a graduate student all of her child's life.

To my mother, Leoda Maye Clemens McMurtry, who gave incalculable assistance on the most tedious of research tasks, who was a great companion on countless road trips to Gainesville, and who loves me no matter what, I give my love, thanks, admiration, and respect.

To my sister, Terri McMurtry Deal, and my brother, Garry Vance McMurtry, I offer heartfelt thanks and love for their often expressed pride in me and their encouragement during this protracted process.

Finally, I wish to honor the memory of my late father, Ferhn Vance McMurtry, who was my greatest teacher, my unwavering advocate, and my finest exemplar of the quintessential lifelong learner. I am so proud and grateful to be my father's daughter.

To these five most important people in my life, I am forever indebted. It is with profound humility, love, and appreciation that I dedicate this dissertation to them.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to express her deep appreciation to Dr. James Hensel for his continuous guidance, support, expertise, and patience as chairman of her doctoral committee. Sincere thanks are extended to Dr. Carl Beeman, Dr. David Honeyman, and Dr. Emmett Williams for their wise counsel and availability, particularly in the latter stages of the research process.

To the individuals who so willingly took time from their busy schedules to participate in this study, the author expresses heartfelt gratitude.

Although too numerous to list here, appreciation is extended to the many professional colleagues, personal friends, and relatives who have shown genuine interest in and repeatedly offered encouragement to the author throughout her doctoral program.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

page

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS iv

ABSTRACT ix

CHAPTERS

1 INTRODUCTION 1

Statement of the Problem 3
Purpose of the Study 4
Justification for the Study 5
Delimitations and Limitations 9
Definition of Terms 10
Organization of the Study 11

2 SELECTED REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE 13

Leadership Theory 13
The Trait Period 14
The Contingency Period 16
The Behavior Period 18
Educational Leadership 23
Adult Education Administration 30
Summary 31

3 METHODOLOGY 34

Procedure 34
Hypotheses and Subhypotheses 35
Identification of Leaders and Nonleaders 40
The Reputational Technique 43
Sample Size 46
Data Collection 46
Instrumentation 47

Data Analysis 53
Discriminant Function Analysis 55
Logistic Regression 57

4 RESULTS 59

Hypothesis One 60
Subhypothesis One 65
Subhypothesis Two 65
Subhypothesis Three 68
Subhypothesis Four 68
Subhypothesis Five 69
Subhypothesis Six 70
Subhypothesis Seven 71
Subhypothesis Eight 71
Subhypothesis Nine 72
Subhypothesis Ten 73
Subhypothesis Eleven 74
Subhypothesis Twelve 75
Hypothesis Two 78
Subhypothesis One 79
Subhypothesis Two 80
Subhypothesis Three 81
Subhypothesis Four 82
Hypothesis Three 83
Adult Education Administrator Personal Data
Survey Information 85
Age 87
Gender 88
Educational Attainment Level 89
Employment Circumstance 93
Summary of Findings 97

5 DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS 100

Discussion 100
LBDQ-XII Composite Scores 102
Dimension Subscale Scores 103
Demographics 106
Regression Values 115
Adult Education Leader and
Administrator Characteristics 118
Conclusions 121
Recommendations 125

APPENDICES

A ADULT EDUCATION ADMINISTRATOR PERSONAL DATA SURVEY 127

B LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE FORM XII 128

C LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE FORM XII SUBSCALE ITEMS 135

D LETTER REQUESTING LIST OF NAMES FOR REPUTATIONAL TECHNIQUE 136

E REMINDER POSTCARD REQUESTING NAMES FOR REPUTATIONAL TECHNIQUE 137

F LETTER REQUESTING ADMINISTRATORS' LEADER LISTS 138

G FOLLOW-UP POSTCARD FOR LEADER LISTS 139

H SECOND FOLLOW-UP POSTCARD FOR LEADER LISTS 140

I LETTER TO PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS 141

J FOLLOW-UP POSTCARD TO LEADERS AND NONLEADERS 142

K SECOND POSTCARD TO LEADERS AND NONLEADERS 143

L LETTER REQUESTING PERMISSION TO USE THE LBDQ-XII 144

M PERMISSION LETTER TO USE THE LBDQ-XII 145

REFERENCES 146

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH 152

LIST OF TABLES

Table		page
4-1	Response Rates	59
4-2	Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire-Form XII (LBDQ-XII) Composite Scores and Significance Values	62
4-3	LBDQ-XII Mean and Standard Deviation Scores by Sample Population and Group	63
4-4	LBDQ-XII Mean and Standard Deviation Scores by Gender	64
4-5	Logistic Regression Analysis of the Demand Reconciliation Dimension and Demographic Variables Scores	80
4-6	Age Statistics by Group and Sample Population	87
4-7	Age Distribution by Decades	88
4-8	Gender Statistics by Group, Subgroup, and Sample Population	89
4-9	Educational Attainment Level and Mean Age by Group and Sample Population	90
4-10	Educational Attainment Level by Gender	92
4-11	Employment Circumstance by Group and Sample Population	94
4-12	Employment Circumstance by Education Attainment Level	95
4-13	Employment Circumstance by Gender	97

Abstract of Dissertation Presented to the Graduate School
of the University of Florida in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Education

CHARACTERISTICS OF SELECTED FLORIDA ADULT EDUCATION LEADERS AND ADMINISTRATORS

By

BEVERLY McMURTRY GRISSOM

August, 1994

Chairman: Dr. James W. Hensel
Major Department: Educational Leadership

The purpose of this study was to conduct an analysis of the leader characteristics of adult education administrators in terms of a core set of leader behaviors for use in career planning, preservice and inservice training, and staff selection criteria. The sample for this study was composed of 313 Florida adult education administrators; 154 were identified by their peers as leaders in adult education and 159 were administrators who were not identified as leaders. The leaders were identified using the Reputational Technique by which knowledgeable persons, termed key informants, are asked to supply names of people who meet specific criteria for use in defining a population pool.

The leader behavior of the two groups was measured using their scores on the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire-Form XII

(LBDQ-XII), recorded from the frame of reference of the reality of the job as they know it from experience, and their responses to questions on the Adult Education Administrator Personal Data Survey. Three hypotheses and 16 subhypotheses were tested at the .05 level of significance.

Discriminant function analysis was used to compare the peer-identified leaders' and the nonleaders' scores on the 12 leader behavior dimension subscales of the LBDQ-XII. Logistic regression analysis was used to ascertain differences between the two groups in terms of four demographic variables and the effects of those variables on leader behavior dimensions for which significant score differences were found.

The findings evidenced no significant difference between leaders and nonleaders on the 12 LBDQ-XII dimensions; however, on one dimension, Demand Reconciliation, the significance score was so distinctly different in comparison to the others that further analysis was done. Significant differences were found between the groups in two components of the employment circumstance variable: working in (a) a school district or (b) a community college in which there was shared responsibility for adult education programs. These same two components of the employment circumstance demographic variable were found to be related to the difference between the groups in terms of the LBDQ-XII's Demand Reconciliation leader behavior dimension. In the analysis of the subjects' leader characteristics, similarities and differences were discussed in detail.

CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Despite the Adult Education Act of 1966 and the amendments enacted between 1968 and 1991 (Public Law 100-297), adult education still has not achieved either fiscal or professional parity with other American educational enterprises. The 1966 federal act requires that states which access the monies appropriated under the act submit an adult education program plan. Florida's program plan includes nine indicators of program quality, the ninth of which addresses ongoing staff development. The specific language of the document refers to skills needed to ensure quality instruction. Leadership development, although not specifically addressed, would surely be included in this category. Certainly, effective leaders contribute to the quality of instruction. The majority of the training offered, however, is intended for a broader audience and usually targets teachers, with less attention focused on administrators. There is no question that training teachers in leadership skills is a viable strategy for enhancing instructional quality; however, it is equally important to focus attention on developing and improving leadership skills among those individuals who are responsible for instructional program planning, development, implementation, oversight and evaluation--the administrators. The absence of such focus

may contribute to a diminished leadership base among adult education administrators.

The educational missions of both school districts and community colleges are prescribed in Florida law. In neither instructional delivery system is adult education the primary mission. In chapter 228.041, paragraph 1(a) of Florida Statutes (Florida School Laws, 1990) regarding the general provisions of public education, the definition of the state system of public education, specifically public schools, is provided. Of the 7 priorities listed, adult education is ranked fourth. In chapter 240.301, paragraph 3 of the same publication, the definition, mission, and responsibilities of community colleges are detailed; adult education is listed as part of a "separate and secondary role" for community colleges (Florida School Laws, 1990, p. 331). Shearon and Tollefson (1989) cited research by Fountain and Tollefson which reviewed the mission statements and priorities of several community college systems. Of the 6 common elements/priorities formulated from the review, adult general education was listed fifth and was grouped with special populations (such as women and minorities), special projects, and special needs students. Adult education did not even merit its own category; yet, in the same discussion, the authors stated that community colleges have evolved as one of the major institutions educating illiterate and underliterate adults in America and that the number of students in this program area is increasing dramatically. This lower priority status,

particularly in the face of growing societal need and the concomitant increase in program enrollment, has contributed to the marginality of the field of adult education and thus to its leadership vacuum. Courtney (1989) noted that we do not adequately understand why adult education has been constrained in its potential for contributing to improvement of American life. He said that failure to deal with this issue has led to a de-emphasis on leadership in the training of adult educators.

Because adult education is rarely, if ever, the primary mission of an education agency, many administrators of adult education (and most teachers) are part-time employees who may hold other full-time jobs. The career path into leadership roles in adult education programs is most often serendipitous and circuitous. All too frequently, individuals with neither experience nor training about adult learners or adult education program operation are placed in administrative positions in adult education.

Statement of the Problem

The problem addressed in this study is the circumstance of adult education programs often not having effective leaders who can lead the charge to enfranchise adult education programs fully with respect to state and national legislation and full funding. Rose (1991), lamenting the leadership void in adult education, stated that adult educators focus on administration rather than the broader issues involved in leadership. Only very infrequently are preservice or inservice training programs provided for

adult education administrators. Mason (1991) stated that the part-time nature of the field of adult education makes positive visionary leadership all the more important a characteristic of the program administrator, even more so than in other fields of education which have full-time personnel.

Decision makers who are in a position to select administrators for adult education programs in their areas of responsibility usually have virtually no understanding of or information on adult education issues. They often do not have proper or adequate information to use as guides in hiring individuals who, because they have expertise in the field and understand its relevant issues, are capable of administering and leading adult education programs, are committed to adult learning as a professional arena, and have the vision to be more than just a maintainer of the status quo.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to conduct an analysis of the leader characteristics of adult education administrators in terms of a core set of leader behaviors for use in career planning, preservice and inservice training, and staff selection criteria. The research questions addressed in this study were as follows:

1(a). Is there a difference between peer-identified leaders and nonleaders in the weighted linear combination of the 12 dimension scores of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire-Form XII (LBDQ-XII)?

1(b). Which of the 12 dimension scores on the LBDQ-XII discriminate between peer-identified leaders and nonleaders?

2. Is there a difference between the leaders and nonleaders in the weighted linear combination of four selected demographic variables?

3. Is there a difference between the leaders and nonleaders in the weighted linear combination of selected LBDQ-XII dimension scores and selected demographic variables (with the dimension score selections to be based on the answers to research questions 1[a] and 1[b])?

Justification for the Study

There has been much written in recent years about the decline in the United States' ranking in the world in terms of residents' literacy rate. The continuing influx of nonnative speakers of English and rapid advances in technology are key phenomena to note when identifying challenges facing education entities in the United States. The dropout rate and the need to continually retrain the workforce are also important current issues to be addressed by the American education system. According to Rose (1991), the perception of American decline led to an increased interest in research on leadership. These same circumstances have resulted in a renewed focus on adult education programs. Now more than ever, these specialized programs require administrators with strong leadership skills who can provide the supervisory, fiscal, and curriculum leadership necessary to offer creative and effective programs to meet the needs of the diverse student

population and the demands of the workplace and society. Maxson and Sistrunk (1973) contended that change is demanded of education and that change requires leadership with a capability far beyond simple, reactive response to pressures. They asserted that the type of leadership needed suggested the capability of initiating organizational movement towards continuous renewal and development in response to changing needs. Bennis wrote that if ever there were a moment in history when a comprehensive strategic view of leadership was needed, this is certainly it (Buffie, 1989). Hersey and Blanchard (1977) stated that there is a continual search for persons with the necessary ability to lead effectively. They noted that the shortage of effective leadership is evident in education. Rose (1991) asserted that leadership lies at the very core of administering adult education programs, going beyond routine aspects of management to include vision about the future. Recognizing that schools have to change their program goals in order to prepare workers for an international economy and citizens for a pluralistic civic culture, Mitchell and Tucker (1992) were not surprised that education policy and decision makers talk about the critical importance of leadership for administrators. Mitchell (1990) stated that what is needed is a new vision of leadership within the parameters of the process of education. In his discussion of selecting school leaders, Murphy (1989) pointed out that research on excellence in education has revealed that the quality of education is a consequence of sound leadership.

Mason (1991) stated that, although many adult education professionals are frequently trained to become good technicians, they are not taught to be effective leaders. He observed that adult educator preparation programs tend to offer training in strategies for administering learning activities rather than in leadership skills. Gilbert (1976) expressed the belief that there must be special concern for the leadership provided to adult education programs.

All too often individuals who are administrators of adult education are appointed to the post for reasons other than evidence of specific experience in administration or adult education. Many aspire to be a K-12 school principal and see the adult education administrator position as a path to that goal: They see the position merely as a means to an end. The position is sometimes used as a placement for someone whose goal is to be an administrator, but for whom there is no other available position. It is even occasionally used as a patronage reward. Murphy (1989) noted that the selection of school leaders has evolved into a personnel management practice that is characterized by politics, patronage, and personal influence. Griffith (1969) identified states in which the adult education program administrator position served as a proving ground for those with aspirations of becoming a principal. These situations, still common today, render the adult education position as inferior and may encourage ambitious

administrators to regard their positions as stepping stones and consequently to leave the field of adult education as a condition of promotion.

This somewhat haphazard way of administrative staffing in adult education is likely a significant contributor to the perpetuation of the "stepchild" status of the program, not only by virtue of the lack of a systematic qualifications-based search for the administrator, but also by the limitations consequently placed on the quality of the program if the individual chosen is not an effective leader. Rosenthal (1977) stated that only rarely is an adult education program successful without superior leadership.

Some recent research on the leader behavior of adult education administrators has focused on job analysis of the adult community education administrator position (Guglielmino, Frock, & Burrichter, 1988) and leader behavior within the framework of job satisfaction among adult education administrators (Rosenthal, 1977), but there is a significant lack of research which focuses on the leader behavior of adult education program administrators. Crew and Easton (1990), citing Courtney's review of 8 years of professional literature in which only three references pertained to adult literacy leadership, concluded that "leadership in adult literacy programs has not been a major topic of the adult education professional literature" (p. 30). In order to staff adult education programs with leaders who are skilled in field, it is essential for decision makers to be versed in what to look for in a prospective adult education program administrator.

It is equally important that a pool of appropriately prepared applicants be available from among whom decision makers may choose. Burns (1978) stated that what may be most important in shaping leaders is learning from experience, from people, from successes and failures, and from other leaders and followers. He noted that Bandura and Walters have done research which showed that behavior is learned by conditioning and by imitating persons with whom the learner identifies and who are taken as models.

It is hoped that the research results reported herein are a useful addition to the knowledge base regarding the leader behavior of adult education program administrators.

Delimitations and Limitations

The following restrictions were observed in conducting the study:

1. The study was limited to data gathered from 313 adult educators in Florida.

2. Data collection was limited to responses to the leadership questionnaire and a personal data survey.

3. The leader behaviors measured were restricted to those dimensions measured by the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire-Form XII.

The following limitations were recognized in this investigation:

1. The identification of the leaders was based on the individual definitions of leadership held by the key informants.

2. Responses to the leadership questionnaire were based on the respondents' individual and independent perceptions of the reality of their work situations.

3. Because data were gathered from administrators in Florida only, no generalizations about leadership behavior can be made to any other adult education administrators.

Definition of Terms

Adult education administrators are those educators whose professional responsibility is to plan, organize, manage, lead, and evaluate the programming, staffing, financing, and marketing of systematic and sustained learning activities which are designed to bring about changes in knowledge, attitudes, values, or skills of those students whose major social roles are characteristic of adult status (adapted from Smith & Offerman, 1982, p. 247 and Darkenwald & Merriam, 1982, p. 9).

Behavior is action, reaction, or function under specified circumstances which is a consequence of the interaction of the individual, group, situation, and cultural norms (adapted from The American Heritage Dictionary, 1985, p. 63 and Lewin [cited in Bass, 1990, p. 611]).

Leader is defined as an individual who is the primary agent for the determination of and/or influence on group structure, atmosphere, goals, ideology, and activities (adapted from Krech & Crutchfield [cited in Bass, 1990, p. 8]).

Leadership is the process of influencing the activities of an individual or a group in efforts toward goal achievement in a given situation (Hersey & Blanchard, 1977, p. 84).

Organization of the Study

Chapter 1 is an introduction to the study. General introductory comments, statement of the problem, the purpose of the study, delimitations and limitations of the study, justification for the study, and definition of terms are included in this chapter.

Chapter 2 contains a review of the pertinent literature. This chapter consists of information concerning leadership theory and its evolution through distinctive periods, the LBDQ-XII, educational leadership, adult education administration, and a summary.

Chapter 3 presents the design of the study. The research questions and related hypotheses and subhypotheses are stated in this chapter. Information is provided on the population, the reputational technique, sample size, data collection, and the LBDQ-XII.

Chapter 4 includes a discussion of the analysis of data and presentation of the significant findings.

Chapter 5 consists of a discussion of the analysis of the characteristics of adult education administrators and leaders in Florida. Also presented in this chapter are the conclusions drawn from the analysis of the

data, the implications of those conclusions, and recommendations for further research.

References and appendices are provided following Chapter 5. Included in the appendices are copies of the two data-gathering instruments and the research-related correspondence.

CHAPTER 2
SELECTED REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The purpose of this chapter is to review the literature and research relevant to the study of adult education administrators. The focus of this study is on the leader behavior of adult education administrators.

Leadership Theory

The one point of consensus among theorists is that there is no agreement on a definition of leadership and no single universally accepted leadership theory. James MacGregor Burns observed that "leadership is one of the most observed and least understood phenomena on earth" (Kellerman, 1984, p. ix). Buffie (1989) observed that decades of analysis have yielded more than 350 definitions of leadership. He emphasized that there is no consensus on what distinguishes leaders from nonleaders or effective from ineffective leaders. In the early years, studies tried to tie leadership potential or capacity to selected personal traits, but this research has not resulted in the development of a formula for leader selection (Giammatteo & Giammatteo, 1981). Stogdill (1974) stated that leadership should be defined in terms of those variables that contribute to the differentiation and maintenance of group goals. He defined it as the "initiation and maintenance of structure in expectation and interaction" and considered this

definition to be in keeping with the findings of research on the emergence of leaders in initially unstructured groups as well as in established groups (Stogdill, 1974, p. 411). He considered leadership to be an aspect of role differentiation.

The scientific study of leadership appears to fall roughly into three periods. The "trait period" spanned the turn of the century up to World War II. The "behavior period" started at the beginning of the second World War and continued through the late 1960s. The "contingency period" began in the late 1960s and continues today. A discussion of the three periods is presented here.

The Trait Period

The early research was focused on leaders rather than on leadership and was rooted in the notion that those who became leaders were somehow different from other people. For many researchers, the trait approach to studying leadership suggested that there were certain characteristics, such as energy, friendliness, or charisma, that were essential for effective leadership. These inherent qualities were assumed to be transferable from one situation to the next. The trait theory approach suggested that leadership training would be helpful only to those with inherent leadership traits. Researchers attempted to identify the unique features of the individual that might be associated with his/her leadership. Among the commonly used research strategies were comparison of the results of

personality tests of leaders and followers, observation of behavior in group situations, choice of associates, nomination or rating by "expert" observers, and analysis of case histories and biographical data (Mazlish, 1984). At the same time, sociologists who observed that power and leadership flowed from the top centered their research around communication patterns as the reason for the directive structure.

Stogdill (1974) noted that during the first 30 years of the century, leadership was defined as a function of the group process. He cited studies undertaken by a variety of researchers--Cooley, Mumford, Blackmar, Chapin, Bernard, Brown, to name a few--as evidence of that focus.

For many writers on the subject during this period, the Great-Man theory explained the concept of leadership. The history of the world was shaped over the centuries by great men who created what the masses could accomplish (Bass, 1990). Great women were virtually ignored in the body of work during that era.

A number of researchers analyzed the trait theorists' work and concluded that several traits differentiated leaders from followers, the traits needed to be a leader changed dependent upon the situation, and the trait approach did not address the interaction of the leader and the followers (Bass, 1990). In 1948, after reviewing over 120 trait studies, Ralph Stogdill found contradictory results, leading him to conclude that situational

characteristics must be integrated with traits in order to adequately theorize about leadership (Bass, 1990; Chemers, 1984).

The Contingency Period

In the late 1960s, Fiedler conducted research centered on a personality measure called the esteem for the "least preferred coworker," or the LPC Scale, which he found to be related to group performance. His extensive study covered 15 years and led him to determine that leadership style alone was not sufficient to explain leader effectiveness. His work culminated in the development of a model which integrated situational parameters into the leadership equation. He developed a scale of situational control based on three features of the situation: leader-member relations, task structure, and position power. His "Contingency Model" was very controversial. Heretofore, researchers on training had contended that specific training had few consistent effects on group performance or satisfaction. In direct conflict with that contention was the Contingency Model research, which indicated that training has its most powerful effects on the leader's situational control (Chemers, 1984). Paisey (1984) conducted research that led him to the conclusion that circumstances create leaders because opportunities for leadership arise when there is present an expressed need or demand and an available individual relatively able at that time to meet it. In other words, given the appropriate circumstances or situations, anybody can be a leader.

Hersey and Blanchard (1977) developed the Tri-dimensional Leader Effectiveness Model, which differentiates self perceptions from others' perceptions of a leader's style. The model was an attempt to integrate the concepts of leader style with situational demands of a given environment.

Other contingency-oriented theories have also addressed the relationship between group morale and performance and the leader's decision-making style. Probably the best known of these is the Normative Decision Theory presented by Vroom and Yetton (1973). These researchers identified a range of decision-making styles which are categorized as autocratic, consultative, and group. The model indicates which of the styles is most likely to result in effective decisions under varying circumstances. It assumes that there is no one best way to make decisions. There is only sparce support for the theory. Although the classifications in the theory are similar to Fiedler's, they differ on the issue of the ability of people to change their decision styles. Fiedler maintained that leader style arises from stable, enduring personality attributes which are difficult to change. In contrast, Vroom and Yetton theorized that personality attributes can and do change.

McGregor (1966) identified two types of organizational leadership--Theory X and Theory Y. His model was grounded in the assumption that leaders perceive people as either inherently lazy or possessing motivation and a desire to do well. Leaders who espouse the former are directive;

those who believe the latter change the organization to meet the needs of the subordinates while meeting organizational objectives.

The widely acclaimed Managerial Grid, developed by Blake and Mouton (1964), presented leadership as two distinct dimensions along two axes. One represents concern for people; the other, concern for production. Leaders may be high on both axes, low on both, or high on one and low on the other. These theorists postulated that leaders who rate high on both axes are those who develop subordinates into followers who are committed to the accomplishment of tasks and have a sense of interdependence because of their common purpose.

The Behavior Period

In his classic study in 1939, Kurt Lewin trained graduate research assistants in autocratic, democratic, and laissez-faire leadership styles. The results of the observations of the graduate assistants' leadership of boys club participants indicated that the democratic style of leadership was somewhat more effective in group processes than the other two styles. The real value of this work is its definition of leadership in behavioral, rather than trait-based terms (Chemers, 1984).

In 1945, the Bureau of Business Research at The Ohio State University attempted to identify various dimensions of leader behavior. Hemphill's research at the Bureau in 1949 and 1950 led to the identification of 1,800 items which described various dimensions of leader behavior. He

and his colleagues agreed that 150 of the items fit only one subscale. These items were used to develop the first form of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (Bass, 1981). The instrument was composed of 40 statements about various aspects of leader behavior. Respondents rated a leader by selecting a number on a rating scale which represented the amount or frequency of a behavior that had been observed in the leader being rated (Bass, 1990).

Empirical research done by Halpin and Winer (Stogdill, 1963), which used factor analysis on item intercorrelations, resulted in the identification of two factors which had been identified by Hemphill as Consideration of Others and Initiation of Structure. The former factor refers to behavior having to do with interpersonal warmth and concern for the feelings of others and indicative of mutual trust, respect, friendship, and warmth in the relationship between the leader and the group members (Chemers, 1984; Hersey & Blanchard, 1977). The latter factor refers to the leader's behavior in delineating the relationship with and among the members of the work group and endeavoring to establish well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communication, and methods of procedure and is concerned with directiveness, goal facilitation, and task-related feedback. These two factorially defined subscales have been used extensively in studies in military organizations, industry, and education. Other research work done by Fleishman in the early 1950s and then by Halpin in the late 1950s and their

respective associates confirmed the existence of the two factors. They were labeled as employee-oriented versus production-oriented behavior or task versus socio-emotional behavior. It is widely held that the identification of two reliable dimensions of leader behavior was a major step forward for the research field of leadership (Chemers, 1984).

In 1951 Hemphill, Seigel, and Westie developed the Ideal LBDQ, a form designed for use in measuring ideal leader behavior. In 1953 Halphin developed an abbreviated version of the LBDQ which used only 40 items to measure leader behavior on the two dimensions Consideration of Others and Initiation of Structure. The Leadership Opinion Questionnaire, developed by Fleishman in 1957, was designed for self-rating by administrators regarding their leader behavior (Stogdill, 1974).

Many subsequent research projects were undertaken to ascertain consistent patterns between leaders' consideration behavior and subordinate satisfaction and leaders' structuring behavior and group productivity. The results were disappointing. In the research move from studying leaders' values or personalities to what they actually do, researchers used rating scales, interviews, and observations to attempt to identify the exact behaviors in which leaders actually engaged. Arguably the most comprehensive study of leader behavior was that done by Ralph Stogdill using the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire developed by Hemphill at the Ohio State Leadership Studies. His research involved theoretical

analysis of role differentiation and group achievement in which several operative variables were subsequently organized into subscales. This work by Stogdill resulted in the creation of the LBDQ-XII with the addition of 10 other dimensions of leader behavior: Representation, Demand Reconciliation, Tolerance for Uncertainty, Persuasion, Tolerance of Freedom, Role Retention, Production Emphasis, Predictive Accuracy, Integration, and Superior Orientation. Items were developed for the hypothesized subscales; questionnaires were developed, administered, item analyzed, revised, and administered several times to various groups. Subsequent revisions of LBDQ-XII were made as a result of administrations in studies of an army airborne division, a state highway patrol organization, ministers, community leaders, United States senators, and presidents of corporations (Stogdill, 1963).

During both the trait and behavior periods, investigators were trying to ascertain the one "best" style of leadership, but no one style is universally best in all environments and situations. It was from this disappointment that emanated the work that led to the contingency theories already discussed.

Many other less widely known leadership theories proliferated, but they did not have the profound effect on the field as did those described above. An example is the Path-Goal theory, a restrictive model which deals with the effects of specific leader behavior on subordinate motivation and satisfaction. Hollander's studies in the late 1960s of leader legitimization led

to his developing the notion of idiosyncrasy credit which is, in effect, a process of social exchange (Chemers, 1984). Despite the fact that these theories generated a flurry of attention in the field, they have not held up well in subsequent research.

According to Rose (1991), the 1980s saw the emergence of a theory known as transformational leadership, in which the followers are asked to set aside self-interests and focus on the common good. The transformational leader empowers followers to innovate. Chemers (1984) observed that a major gap in leadership theories in the 1980s was the lack of attention to the leaders and followers as people.

Current writers on leadership characterize the scientific research of the last 70 years as a series of false starts, dead ends, and controversies. Even now the debates among theorists continue. Some of the most current theories adopt a contingency perspective; many have imbedded situational features.

The research on leader behavior has continued for the past 50 years, particularly in investigations which use various forms of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire. Because of the endurance of the behavioral approach to describing leadership and the broad-based respect for the LBDQ-XII, the combination appears to be a viable one for research on leadership among adult education administrators.

Educational Leadership

Mitchell (1990) expressed concern that recent leadership research is inconclusive and in serious need of a new beginning. He noted that even though some new theories have cropped up, they are more focused on what leaders do than on what leadership is. He pointed out that much of what is presented as current thinking on educational leadership has been imported from military, political, religious, and business settings. Rose (1991) asserted that the current leadership models do not offer much to those who are trying to understand the leadership vacuum in adult education and the ever-marginal status of the field.

According to Boles and Davenport (1983), Parkinson's work in 1970 led him to believe that leaders are made, not born, and he postulated that imagination, knowledge, ability, determination, ruthlessness, and attraction are the six basic elements of leadership technique. He contended that all of them may be acquired through study and practice. Buffie (1989) considered it much easier to be an administrator or manager than to be an instructional leader. He lamented that there are few inservice programs and little or no professional preparation oriented toward developing instructional leadership skills. Fischer (1978) observed that there are few graduate programs for leadership that address the management of scholarship; scholars learn their management and leadership competencies on the job.

Stefurak (1977/1978) used Stogdill's Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire to determine the ideal nature of leader behavior as rated by all of the university-based community education directors in the United States. He also used the instrument to assess the leader behavior of selected community education coordinators in Florida and investigated the existence of a relationship between the two, as well as with coordinator responses to a survey regarding six personal history variables. He found that years of experience did produce a difference in the perceived behavior of community education coordinators in the constructs labeled Persuasion, Initiation of Structure, and Superior Orientation. When comparing the responses of the national directors regarding identifying the ideal leader behavior to the responses of the coordinators which yielded their perceptions of their own actual behaviors, he found that there were significant differences between the ideal leader behaviors identified by the national directors and the actual leader behaviors exhibited by the community education coordinators. He determined that the personal variables were not good predictors of leader behavior or performance of the coordinators. They should not be used as selection criteria when hiring community education coordinators, nor should they be used as criteria for determining who should be trained in community education. He concluded that the difference between community education leadership theory and community education leadership practice has significant implications for training of community education coordinators.

In her research comparing the perceptions of leader behavior of male and female University of Florida administrators, Keener (1976/1977) used the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire-Form XII as the primary data collection instrument. She developed a Professional Career Interview Guide for use in gathering data about the administrators' career orientation, career development, and career aspirations. The research results indicated that there was little difference in the behavior of the male and female administrators. The results of the interview guides indicate that the females followed less easily discernible career paths to administration, their past work experience was significantly different, and their long-term career goals were different from those of their male counterparts.

Rosenthal (1977) surveyed 115 Michigan adult education administrators and their immediate supervisors using the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire-Form XII in order to compare their perceptions of the leader behavior exhibited by the administrators. He also investigated the relationship between the administrators' reported perceptions about their leader behavior and job satisfaction. Statistical analysis of the responses revealed that adult education administrators saw themselves as behaving significantly more considerately than did their immediate supervisors. The administrators saw themselves as being more task-oriented than did their immediate supervisors, but not significantly so. The administrators' role perceptions were unrelated to their reported level of job satisfaction.

Jones (1981/1982) compared the perceptions of the leader behavior of male and female Jamaican teachers' college administrators in order to determine the extent to which they behave differently as leaders. She studied 38 college administrators: 22 females and 16 males. Using the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire and a Background Survey Questionnaire, she collected data from the administrators, the direct superordinate, and male and female members of the administrators' departments. She found that gender was not an issue on 10 of the 12 dimensions of the LBDQ-XII as scored by the superordinates and the administrators. Significant differences were found on the dimensions Role Assumption and Integration. No differences based on gender were found in the responses of the subordinates. She recommended more studies of women's leader behavior, their career patterns, and their leadership styles.

Mulkerne (1980) used the LBDQ-XII as the primary research data-gathering instrument in her study comparing the perceived leadership behavior in male and female exceptional student education directors in Florida. The participants in the study were 28 superintendents, 14 male and 14 female exceptional student education directors, and 28 male and 28 female exceptional student education staff members. The superintendents and the staff members, by responding to the items on the LBDQ-XII, rated the exceptional student education directors. With the same instrument, the directors rated themselves. The directors also responded to the

investigator-developed Background Survey Instrument, which gathered personal demographic information regarding present job title, age, marital status, years in present position, type of school district, size of student population, size of exceptional student education staff, years of teaching experience, years of administrative experience, and educational degree level. Mulkerne found that male exceptional student education directors scored higher than female exceptional student education directors. On 9 of the 12 dimensions of the LBDQ-XII, she rejected the hypotheses. She found that men scored significantly higher than women on Representation, Persuasion, Tolerance of Freedom, Initiation of Structure, Role Assumption, Production Emphasis, Predictive Accuracy, Integration, and Superior Orientation. No significant difference in scores was found on the Reconciliation, Tolerance of Uncertainty, and Consideration of Others dimensions. Mulkerne found that significant differences in the perceived leadership behavior of the exceptional student education directors existed. When data from the background survey were analyzed, significant differences between the circumstances of men and women were found in each variable. Mulkerne concluded that it could not be determined whether or not the results of her research were due to discrimination against females. She recommended that similar studies of exceptional student education administrators be done in other states; that there be a review of current educational programs preparing individuals for roles in the field of special education; that there be further study of

recruitment, employment, and advancement of people in the field of special education; and that observational studies be done of male and female special education administrators.

Neat (1990,1991) conducted research on 80 Indiana adult education administrators by using the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire-Form XII to determine if relationships existed between Initiation of Structure and Consideration of Others leader behaviors and six variables. The size of the public school district; the size of the adult education program; and characteristics of the administrator--age, gender, years of experience in adult education, and educational attainment levels--were the independent variables used. The study also included a comparison of vector scores on the LBDQ-XII of the adult education administrators and 345 adult education teachers with 3 or more years experience. Statistical analysis revealed that no significant differences existed between the two groups relative to the leader behaviors Initiation of Structure and Consideration of Others and (a) the size of the district, (b) the size of the adult education program, and (c) the years of experience of the adult education administrators. Significant differences were found in terms of the behavior Consideration of Others and age, gender, and educational attainment. Through interviews conducted with 10 adult education administrators, Neat found that the administrators held strong self-perceptions relative to both Initiation of Structure and Consideration of Others leader behaviors. Interviews with 30 randomly

selected adult education teachers indicated that they perceived the adult education administrators to be strong in the Initiation of Structure dimension, but deficient in the Consideration of Others dimension. These findings resulted in the recommendation that adult education administrators attend workshops, university classes, and seminars in management effectiveness and human relations to develop and/or improve their leadership skill in the area of Consideration of Others. There was also a recommendation to conduct similar studies that would include adult education administrators from the public schools as well as from institutions of higher learning and the private sector.

Harris (1979/1980) made a distinction between real behavior and ideal behavior in his research on 10 Florida community college academic deans and their leader behavior. In his research, presidents, deans, and faculty used two dimensions of the LBDQ, Consideration of Others and Initiation of Structure, to rate the deans both in terms of perceived real and envisioned ideal behavior. He related real behavior to respondents' perceptions of how the job was actually being done and ideal behavior to the expectations one might have of how the job should be done. The design of his research was similar to this study in that presidents could be considered the leaders and faculty could be considered the nonleaders. The only significant difference found was between the presidents' and the faculty's ratings of the deans in terms of their expectations regarding leader behavior;

the faculty's expectations were lower than those of the presidents on the Consideration of Others dimension. The greatest importance and relevance of Harris' research work in regard to the study reported here is the concept of real behavior as the frame of reference used in responding to the items on the LBDQ-XII.

Adult Education Administration

The administration of educational programs requires an array of skills. Kimbrough and Nunnery (1988) studied the task areas of educational administration as a part of the Southern States Cooperative Program in Educational Administration. They found that educational program administrators have responsibility for instructional and curriculum development, pupil personnel, community/school leadership, staff personnel, school plant, school transportation, organization and structure, and school finance and business management. Adult education administrators' responsibilities include all of these tasks and more. Griffith (1969) noted that adult education administrators have many of the same responsibilities as school superintendents. He pointed out that the central feature which differentiates the adult education administrators' work from that of other school administrators is that the adult students are not of compulsory school age and must be persuaded to participate. He described adult educators as active community change agents.

Jarvie, Black, and Brahce (1964) wrote that adult education administrators must have special skills and knowledge for the approaches and procedures of adult education which differ from those of elementary or secondary education. They observed that adult education administrators must work constantly to cooperate with outside agencies and must be interested in the adult-oriented affairs of the community.

In addition to understanding adult learning principles, the adult education position is distinct from other types of education program administration in that one must have finely honed marketing, networking, and entrepreneurial skills. The leader behavior of adult education administrators is both developed and tested when creating and operating programs that meet the changing needs of adult students.

Summary

Research done over the past 5 decades has approached the study of leadership from quite disparate perspectives. Despite their widely differing theories, the researchers' common contribution to the knowledge base on leadership is that there is apparently no one "best" leadership style, try as they might to discover it. Several writers on the subject are emphatic in their declarations about the need for strong leaders in education. Among several writers quoted, there is agreement that adult education administrators face even greater challenges than their K-12 counterparts because their students are adults with special needs who have a choice in

attending classes and their programs are interconnected with many community groups. They contend that adult education programs require administrators with the leadership skills very similar to those required of school superintendents.

Even though there has been relatively little research on adult education administrators' leader behavior, the studies discussed above are evidence that the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire-Form XII is a useful tool in learning meaningful information about various types of education administrators. In her study of adult education administrators, which involved only two dimensions of the LBDQ-XII, Neat (1990/1991) found significant differences in age, gender, and educational attainment. These three variables are among the four included in the research reported herein. The study discussed here is distinct from those reviewed above in that it involves all 12 of the dimensions of the LBDQ-XII and a unique approach to responding to the LBDQ-XII: the realities of the job frame of reference. Even though Harris (1979/1980) conducted research using only two dimensions of the LBDQ, he found the approach of rating real behavior to be useful in his research design. His work serves to reinforce the utility of the approach used in the study discussed here.

The information obtained from the research project reported herein hopefully supplies useful additions to the lean body of literature on the adult education program administrator. Given the renewed emphasis on the field,

it is imperative that, as a contribution to improvement of the field, the information base be expanded regarding what to look for in adult education administrators for the purposes of training and hiring, as well as issues for consideration in planning for a career in adult education administration.

CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY

Procedure

In order to accomplish the purpose of this study, to conduct an analysis of the leader characteristics of adult education administrators in terms of a core set of leader behaviors for use in career planning, preservice and inservice training, and staff selection criteria, the investigation involved strategies designed to acquire the answers to three research questions:

1(a). Is there a difference between peer-identified leaders and nonleaders in the weighted linear combination of the 12 dimension scores of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire-Form XII (LBDQ-XII)?

1(b). Which of the 12 dimension scores on the LBDQ-XII discriminate between peer-identified leaders and nonleaders?

2. Is there a difference between the leaders and nonleaders in the weighted linear combination of four selected demographic variables?

3. Is there a difference between the leaders and nonleaders in the weighted linear combination of selected LBDQ-XII dimension scores and selected demographic variables (with the dimension score selections to be based on the answers to research questions 1[a] and 1[b])?

Hypotheses and Subhypotheses

The following hypotheses and subhypotheses were constructed for using in data testing as a strategy for answering the three research questions.

Hypothesis one

There is no significant difference in the leader behavior of peer-identified leaders and nonleaders among selected Florida adult education administrators as measured by their scores on the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire-Form XII (LBDQ-XII).

The LBDQ individual item scores collapse into 12 subscale scores (see Appendix C) which indicate the degree to which a respondent behaves in terms of specific identified dimensions of leader behavior. Twelve subhypotheses were constructed regarding those behavior dimension subscales. For each of the following 12 subhypotheses, there are weighted linear combinations of all subscale scores which are dealt with concomitantly in the structure of the analysis.

Subhypothesis one. There is no significant difference between peer-identified leaders and nonleaders among selected Florida adult education administrators in the degree to which they speak and act as representatives of a group as measured by their Representation subscale scores on the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire-Form XII (LBDQ-XII).

Subhypothesis two. There is no significant difference between peer-identified leaders and nonleaders among selected Florida adult education administrators in the degree to which they reconcile conflicting demands and reduce disorder to the system as measured by their Demand Reconciliation subscale scores on the LBDQ-XII.

Subhypothesis three. There is no significant difference between peer-identified leaders and nonleaders among selected Florida adult education administrators in the degree to which they are able to tolerate uncertainty and postponement without anxiety as measured by their Tolerance for Uncertainty subscale scores on the LBDQ-XII.

Subhypothesis four. There is no significant difference between peer-identified leaders and nonleaders among selected Florida adult education administrators in the degree to which they use persuasion and argument effectively and exhibit strong convictions as measured by their Persuasiveness subscale scores on the LBDQ-XII.

Subhypothesis five. There is no significant difference between peer-identified leaders and nonleaders among selected Florida adult education administrators in the degree to which they clearly define their own role and let followers know what is expected of them as measured by their Initiation of Structure subscale scores on the LBDQ-XII.

Subhypothesis six. There is no significant difference between peer-identified leaders and nonleaders among selected Florida adult education

administrators in the degree to which they allow followers scope for initiative, decision, and action as measured by their Tolerance of Freedom subscale scores on the LBDQ-XII.

Subhypothesis seven. There is no significant difference between peer-identified leaders and nonleaders among selected Florida adult education administrators in the degree to which they actively exercise the leadership role, rather than surrender leadership to others, as measured by their Role Assumption subscale scores on the LBDQ-XII.

Subhypothesis eight. There is no significant difference between peer-identified leaders and nonleaders among selected Florida adult education administrators in the degree to which they regard the comfort, well-being, status, and contribution of followers as measured by their Consideration of Others subscale scores on the LBDQ-XII.

Subhypothesis nine. There is no significant difference between peer-identified leaders and nonleaders among selected Florida adult education administrators in the degree to which they apply pressure for productive output as measured by their Production Emphasis subscale scores on the LBDQ-XII.

Subhypothesis ten. There is no significant difference between peer-identified leaders and nonleaders among selected Florida adult education administrators in the degree to which they exhibit foresight and ability to

predict outcomes accurately as measured by their Predictive Accuracy subscale scores on the LBDQ-XII.

Subhypothesis eleven. There is no significant difference between peer-identified leaders and nonleaders among selected Florida adult education administrators in the degree to which they maintain a closely-knit organization and resolve intermember conflict as measured by their Integration subscale scores on the LBDQ-XII.

Subhypothesis twelve. There is no significant difference between peer-identified leaders and nonleaders among selected Florida adult education administrators in the degree to which they maintain cordial relations with superiors, have influence over them, and are striving for higher status as measured by their Superior Orientation subscale scores on the LBDQ-XII.

Hypothesis two

There is no significant difference between peer-identified leaders and nonleaders among selected Florida adult education administrators based on the demographic variables of age, gender, educational attainment level, and employment circumstance (employed by a community college with sole responsibility for adult education, employed by a school district with sole responsibility for adult education, employed by a community college with shared responsibility for adult education, employed by a school district with shared responsibility for adult education, or neither).

The four subhypotheses associated with this hypothesis address each demographic variable separately. Even though each variable is analyzed separately, it should be noted that for each of the independent variables studied, the analysis structure controls for the other three.

Subhypothesis one. There is no significant difference between peer-identified leaders and nonleaders among selected Florida adult education administrators based on age.

Subhypothesis two. There is no significant difference between peer-identified leaders and nonleaders among selected Florida adult education administrators based on gender.

Subhypothesis three. There is no significant difference between peer-identified leaders and nonleaders among selected Florida adult education administrators based on educational attainment level.

Subhypothesis four. There is no significant difference between peer-identified leaders and nonleaders among selected Florida adult education administrators based on employment circumstance (employed by a community college with sole responsibility for adult education, employed by a school district with sole responsibility for adult education, employed by a community college with shared responsibility for adult education, employed by a school district with shared responsibility for adult education, or neither).

Hypothesis three

There is no significant difference between peer-identified leaders and nonleaders among selected Florida adult education administrators in the weighted linear combination of selected LBDQ-XII dimension scores as determined in the analysis of Ho_1, controlling for the demographic variables of age, gender, educational attainment level, and employment circumstance (employed by a community college with sole responsibility for adult education, employed by a school district with sole responsibility for adult education, employed by a community college with shared responsibility for adult education, employed by a school district with shared responsibility for adult education, or neither).

Identification of Leaders and Nonleaders

In order to collect a list of participants to serve as the population for this descriptive research study, the reputational method was used. A list of the names of all adult education administrators in Florida was developed by requesting the names and mailing addresses of adult education administrators from each school district and community college that operates adult education programs in Florida (Appendix D). The request was mailed to the names listed as local adult education directors in the Adult and Community Education Decision Makers and Practitioners Directory, which is distributed by the Division of Vocational, Adult and Community Education of the Florida Department of Education. Additionally, the request was sent to

the names of the community college adult education administrators included on a list entitled "Continuing Education Standing Committee of the Council on Instructional Affairs," which is distributed by the Florida Department of Education Division of Community Colleges, and to the members of the professional association known as the Florida Administrators of Adult and Community Education. Officials at the Bureau of Adult and Community Education in the Florida Department of Education were contacted to make recommendations for additions to the request list. Requests were mailed to 127 individuals. After 3 weeks, a follow-up postcard (Appendix E) was mailed in an effort to acquire the requested names and addresses. After 2 weeks, telephone calls were placed to officials in those districts from which no reply had been received.

Once the primary population list was complete, a letter (Appendix F) was sent to those 464 adult education administrators (key informants) whose names and addresses were gathered, asking them to name 10 Florida adult education administrators whom they consider to be leaders in adult education in Florida. Postage-paid envelopes were supplied to the addressees. Because the investigator is an adult education administrator in Florida, the letter included assurances of the anonymity of responses submitted. The information received was tallied by a colleague who is not an adult educator and who is unfamiliar with the informants and those whom they named. After a 3-week interim, a reminder postcard was sent to

the population (Appendix G). After 2 more weeks, a second postcard (Appendix H) was sent to the population in an effort to garner a statistically adequate number of responses. Replies were received from 223 of the 464 to whom requests were mailed, for a response rate of 48%. Despite the fact that the response rate was slightly lower than the desired 50%, several factors contributed to the decision to move forward with the study. Firstly, only nine more replies were needed to secure the desired 50% response rate. Secondly, the list of leaders named totaled 316 people, an amount that was considered ample to secure an adequate leader response sample for meaningful data analysis. Finally, analysis of the leader names submitted to determine which districts did not include a leader nominee indicated that no nominee representation occurred in only small rural counties with only one adult education administrator or with the oversight of adult education programs accomplished as a part of the job responsibilities of the vocational director. Most of the unrepresented counties were near Tallahassee, the place from which leadership guidance would likely be sought by adult educators in those counties because it is the location of the Bureau of Adult and Community Education at the Department of Education (D.O.E.). Based on the speculation that those rural county adult education program administrators would likely perceive D.O.E. personnel as leaders, they may well have nominated individuals from the D.O.E. rather than themselves or

each other. In general, the leader nominations were well distributed throughout the state.

Because many of the leader nominee names submitted did not include mailing addresses, attempts were made to secure that information. Ultimately, 51 of the 316 names were unusable, resulting in a leader pool of 265 names. Added to this number were the names of those 295 individuals on the original population list who were not named as leaders, thus creating a nonleader group and a total subject pool of 560. It should be noted that the investigator's name was submitted as a leader in adult education in Florida, but her name was removed from the list and not included in the study.

The Reputational Technique

In the early 1950s, Hunter introduced the reputational technique as a data collection method in his study of power, influence, and leadership in Atlanta, Georgia. The technique involves developing a list of names which is used as pool from among which knowledgeable individuals, called key informants, are asked to independently identify leaders who are then interviewed to ascertain indepth information about power in a given community or group (Kimbrough & Nunnery, 1974). Among the groups Hunter surveyed in order to identify leaders were individuals occupying positions relevant to the contextual leadership arena. His work was focused

on the process of influence and identifying influencers, rather than on the identity of the leaders. The reputational method was designed to be a data-gathering tool to further the next step in a research process (Hunter, 1953). As a result of his study of 54 issues in 18 New England communities, Gamson (1966) determined that reputation is a persuasion resource and persuasion is a useful tool in leadership. He said that those who are named as reputational leaders comprise a pool of individuals with resources that prompt others to identify them as leaders. He contended that there is reality to reputation and that it is consistent with a theoretical interpretation of reputation as a resource.

Jennings (1964) conducted a field study of elites and community decision making in Atlanta in which she employed the reputational method to identify leaders. Employing a variety of methodologies serving as cross checks which all yielded essentially the same list of names, she determined that the reputational method was an effective means of identifying leaders. She found that there is a positive association between reputed influence and performance of decision-making roles. She concluded that those who are perceived to be the most influential do engage in role activities that cause them to be considered influential leaders.

In proffering his theory of symbolic interactionism, Blumer (1969) observed that in the study of human conduct, in which actors (behavers) are carving out lines of action (behaviors), it is of utmost importance to take

their roles and get inside their framework of operation. He considered attitude to be useful in explaining behavior. He said that the study of human groups consistently shows an arrangement of social positions, a hierarchy of status, of leaders and followers.

Polsby (1980) cited research by Schulze and Blumberg which indicated that essentially the same leaders were selected by three panels drawn from different sources. Kirk and Miller (1986) cited research by Freeman in which a reputation for power was seen to coincide with multiple organizational connections and participation in a wide variety of public decisions. Taylor and Bogdan (1984) stated that key informants are excellent primary sources of information.

Patton (1990) advocated a research methodology called triangulation, which is the combination of methodologies in the study of the same phenomena. He said that the logic of triangulation is based on the premise that no single method ever adequately solves the problem and recommended that multiple methods be used in every investigation.

The reputational technique has been continually used as a means by which leaders and influencers are identified. Kimbrough and Nunnery (1974) considered the method to be useful to those engaged in research. Stogdill (1974) noted that research has indicated that members of a group are more discriminating in choice of leaders than in choice of friends. Based on the literature search conducted regarding this methodology and its utility, its use

in this study appears to be appropriate to the data-gathering needs of this effort.

Sample Size

Stevens (1986) cautioned that sample size is critical to accurate interpretation of statistical analysis when using the discriminant function technique. According to him, the ratio of sample size to total population must be large and recommends 20 subjects per variable. Because there are 12 dimensions of the LBDQ-XII that are the variables, a minimum of 120 sample subjects must be identified from each of the two groups; therefore, it was necessary to secure at least 240 usable responses. The 560-subject pool was composed, in part, of the 265 peer-identified leaders whose names were gleaned from the list of 316 identified leaders after 51 names were deleted, having been deemed unusable because addresses could not be located for them. Added to these were the names from the original population list that were not among those identified by key informants as leaders. This latter group of 295 usable names composed the nonleader group. The questionnaire and the personal demographics survey were sent to each member of the resulting pool of 560 individuals.

Data Collection

The 265 peer-identified leaders and the 295 nonleaders were sent a survey packet which contained the Adult Education Administrator Personal Data Survey (Appendix A), a copy of the Leader Behavior Description

Questionnaire-Form XII (Appendix B), a postage-paid return envelope, and a cover letter (Appendix I) which explained the purpose of the research and which assured the anonymity of their responses to the two enclosed surveys. The cover letter instructed the subjects to respond to the items on the LBDQ-XII from the frame of reference of the realities of the job as an adult education administrator as they, from experience, know it to be. The subjects were also asked to respond to the Adult Education Administrator Personal Data Survey in order to ascertain data regarding four demographic variables: age, gender, educational attainment level, and employment circumstance (employed by a community college with sole responsibility for adult education, employed by a school district with sole responsibility for adult education, employed by a community college with shared responsibility for adult education, employed by a school district with shared responsibility for adult education, or neither). In an effort to ensure the maximum number of responses, two follow-up postcards (Appendices J and K) requesting return of the completed questionnaires were mailed to the two groups at 2-week intervals.

Instrumentation

The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire-Form XII (LBDQ-XII) was the primary data-collection instrument used in this study. The LBDQ-XII, developed by Ralph Stogdill (1963), consists of 100 items which describe leader behavior. The questionnaire was designed for use in

describing leaders in terms of 12 dimensions of leader behavior. In the instrument, leader behavior is rated in terms of respondents' objective perceptions as quantified on the basis of frequency of occurrence. Forced choice responses are made to each item by use of a structured answer format allowing for choosing one of five possible responses: always, often, occasionally, seldom, and never. Each item is assigned a score, ranging from 5 to 1; 20 of the items are scored in the reverse (see Appendix C). Each subscale score consists of the sum of the scores from the items of the subscale. There are no score norms established because the instrument is intended for use in research (Stogdill, 1970). The following are the 12 dimensions of leader behavior as defined by Stogdill which are contained in the LBDQ-XII. The number in parenthesis at the end of each definition indicates the number of items in the instrument which measure the dimension. Appendix C indicates which instrument items compose which dimensions.

1. Representation is the degree to which an individual speaks and acts as the representative of the group (5).

2. Demand Reconciliation is the degree to which an individual reconciles conflicting demands and reduces disorder to the system (5).

3. Tolerance for Uncertainty is the degree to which an individual is able to tolerate uncertainty and postponement without anxiety and upset (10).

4. Persuasion is the degree to which an individual uses persuasion and argument effectively and exhibits strong convictions (10).

5. Initiation of Structure is the degree to which an individual clearly defines his own role and allows followers to know what is expected of them (10).

6. Tolerance of Freedom is the degree to which an individual allows followers scope for initiative, decision, and action (10).

7. Role Retention is the degree to which an individual actively exercises the leadership role, rather than surrender leadership to others (10).

8. Consideration of Others is the degree to which an individual regards the comfort, well-being, status, and contribution of followers (10).

9. Production Emphasis is the degree to which an individual applies pressure for productive output (10).

10. Predictive Accuracy is the degree to which an individual exhibits foresight and ability to predict outcomes accurately (5).

11. Integration is the degree to which an individual maintains a closely knit organization and resolves intermember conflict (5).

12. Superior Orientation is the degree to which an individual maintains cordial relations with superiors, has influence over them, and is striving for higher status (10).

The subhypotheses of the first hypothesis are based upon these 12 subscales.

Validity. Stogdill tested the validity of the LBDQ-XII by using scenarios, written by a playwright, for each of the subscales. Each scenario was written based on the items in each subscale that related to the pertinent pattern of behavior. The roles of supervisor and workers were played by experienced actors, and each role was played by two different actors. The performances were captured on motion picture film and shown to observers who used the LBDQ-XII to describe the supervisors' behavior. Because no significant difference was found between the observers' responses to viewing two different actors playing the same role, Stogdill concluded that the scales measured what they were alleged to measure (Stogdill, 1970).

Stogdill also used the LBDQ-XII to obtain descriptions of college and university presidents and international labor union presidents. The results showed that each factor is, in fact, dominated by the single appropriate scale: The scales do measure what they were designed to measure. These findings indicated that the behavior of leaders, though complex, can be differentiated by subordinates and measured effectively. Each subscale is

composed of either 5 or 10 items and represents a rather complex pattern of behaviors.

In 1957, Halpin reported that between-group versus within-group respondent agreement analysis of variance yielded in all cases F ratios that were significant at the .01 level. This score indicated that followers tend to agree in describing the same leader and that the descriptions of different leaders differ significantly (Stogdill, 1963).

Reliability. Reliability of the LBDQ-XII has been established by using a modified Kuder-Richardson scale. In this approach, each item was correlated with the other items in the subscale rather than with the subscale score including that item. The procedure yielded reliability coefficient scores ranging from .54 to .91 using nine different groups of leaders (Stogdill, 1963). Dipboye's (1978) review of the LBDQ-XII refers to Stogdill's report of a study of interrater reliability on the instrument, which indicated a high degree of agreement. He cited research on the test-retest reliability coefficients of between .57 and .72 for the Initiation of Structure subscale and between .71 and .79 for the Consideration of Others subscale. Noting the LBDQ-XII's internal consistency, Dipboye characterized it as the best of the Ohio State Leadership Scales. He considered it to be best used for research.

Even though the respondents were asked to rate the behavior items on the LBDQ-XII in terms of the reality of the job of adult education

administrator and despite the fact that the core behaviors identified as a result of data analysis and included in the Adult Education Leader Profile might be considered the ideal behaviors for adult education administrators, the form of the LBDQ which is designed to measure ideal leader behavior was determined to be inappropriate for use in this study. It is not considered to be a strong version of the LBDQ. Use of the ideal version in research studies has shown that the leaders' attitudes toward Consideration of Others and Initiation of Structure are not highly related to any measures of leader effectiveness, whether using objective criteria or ratings by superiors, peers, or subordinates. Further, use of the ideal form of the LBDQ in research indicated that the leaders' ideal of how they should behave was not highly related to their behavior as described by subordinates. Finally, it was found that discrepancies between expected (ideal) and observed (real) behavior are highly and negatively related to measures of group behavior and member satisfaction (Stogdill, 1974). A realistic view of the position of adult education administrator and its associated behaviors as indicated by the leaders' responses that are significantly different from those made by nonleaders on the LBDQ-XII may lead to the identification of the core set of leader behaviors that one should ideally exhibit as an adult education administrator who is an effective leader.

The Adult Education Administrator Personal Data Survey (see Appendix A), designed by the investigator, was sent to the adult education

administrators in Florida identified as leaders by the key informants and to those administrators who were not named as leaders as a means of gathering demographic information. The use of the first person singular in the survey is patterned after the untitled personal data gathering instrument used by Stefurak (1977/1978) in his research on leader behavior among community education coordinators.

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics to measure frequencies and percentages were used to describe the respondents with respect to selected personal and situational factors. The personal factors investigated were age, gender, and educational attainment level. Situational factors were employment in a school district or community college with sole responsibility for operating adult education programs, employment in a community college or school system in a county in which there is shared responsibility between the two systems for adult education programs, and employment in neither of those educational entities.

The primary hypothesis of this study was that there is no significant difference in the leader behavior of peer-identified leaders and nonleaders among selected Florida adult education administrators as measured by their scores on the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire-Form XII. A second hypothesis of the study was that there is no significant difference between peer-identified leaders and nonleaders among selected Florida adult

education administrators based on the demographic variables of age, gender, educational attainment level, and employment circumstance (employed in a community college with sole responsibility for adult education, employed in a school district with sole responsibility for adult education, employed in a community college with shared responsibility for adult education, employed in a school district with shared responsibility for adult education, or neither). A third hypothesis of the study stated that there is no significant difference between the leaders and nonleaders in terms of selected LBDQ-XII dimension scores while controlling for demographic variable scores. The selection of the LBDQ-XII dimension score used in testing the third hypothesis was determined through data analysis specific to the first hypothesis and its subhypotheses. Significance was set at the .05 level. The significant score variance identified indicated behavior that is specific to leaders and in what particular situation or specific to which of the four demographic variables. The item on which notable variance was found between the identified leaders and nonleaders was included in the discussion of adult education leader characteristics.

The statistical procedure determined to be most appropriate to the analysis of the data in order to answer the first research question and its respective hypothesis and subhypotheses was discriminant function analysis. The second and third research questions and their related

hypotheses and subhypotheses were answered by applying to the pertinent data logistic regression analysis.

Discriminant Function Analysis

According to Klecka (1980), discriminant analysis is a statistical technique which is used to ascertain and study the differences between two or more groups simultaneously with regard to several variables. It also serves to categorize other subjects into the identified groups. The technique was first developed by Fisher in the mid-1930s in his efforts to solve problems in biology and physical anthropology. Early uses of the technique in social sciences research involved educational and psychological testing. It has been used by political scientists to study voting behavior, legislative factions, and felony court case dispositions. In psychology, it has been used extensively in personnel testing (Klecka, 1980). Klecka wrote that a researcher is able to discriminate between two groups based on a set of characteristics, that it is possible to assess how well the characteristics discriminate and which of them are most powerful in distinguishing between groups, and that one or more mathematical equations can be devised which are called discriminant functions.

Kleinbaum and Kupper (1978) wrote that discriminant function analysis is concerned with the problem of distinguishing between two populations on the basis of observations which are multivariate in nature. They indicated that the statistical goal is to develop a rule, a discriminant

function, which is based on the measurements obtained on each individual in the sample of a population which will assist in determining the points of difference or how to discriminate between the two groups. It attempts to describe individuals and groups by using a linear model to quantify the relationship between several independent variables and a dependent variable for the purpose of that discrimination. Stevens (1986) called the discriminant function "uncorrelated linear combinations of the original variables" (p. 232). He considered the discriminant function analysis technique attractive due to its capacity to narrow specifically the differences between two groups; he characterized the technique as having clarity of interpretation because distinguishing between two groups by one function is not related to discerning between the groups by a different function. Stepwise discriminant analysis will be used in order to ensure identification of those variable combinations which serve as the best indicators of differences between the two groups. As Kleinbaum and Kupper (1978) point out, stepwise discriminant analysis allows for scrutiny at each step of the process for determining the importance both of the variables which have already been included and those that are being considered for inclusion in the discriminant function.

In his research designed to determine the applicability of the discriminant function analysis technique to social science survey research data, Carpenter (1969) used data on Italian voters contained in

The Civic Culture, a book written by Gabriel Almond and Sidney Verba. His research focus was to determine if the group of Italian respondents (nonidentifiers) who, according to the reports by Almond and Verba, did not identify their political party membership could be categorized as communists or noncommunists by applying discriminant function analysis. He began the process by measuring the differences between the scores of the noncommunists and communists who self-reported on the 21 discriminating questions from the original survey instrument used in gathering the data reported in The Civic Culture, utilizing discriminant analysis. Data analysis resulted in removal of four of the variables. The response scores of the nonidentifiers were then compared to the calculated coefficients of those who had self-identified. Carpenter concluded that discriminant function analysis can be applied to "soft" social science data.

In the study reported herein, the two groups have been identified through the reputational technique for the leaders and the inclusion of those adult education administrators in the population pool who were not identified as leaders as the nonleaders. The variables considered in the analyses were the 12 dimensions of the LBDQ-XII and four demographic variables.

Logistic Regression

For the purpose of examining how the four demographic variables interact with the one dimension of the LBDQ-XII on which leaders and nonleaders scored notably differently, the logistic regression statistical

technique was employed. Neter, Wasserman, and Kutner (1985) wrote that when dependent variables are indicator variables, recorded for statistical analysis as binary data, the curvilinear response function is called the logistic function. Press and Wilson (1978) reported that the logistic regression model is formulated by mathematically relating the probability of some event occurring on a vector of explanatory variables. The model is used for classifying an object into one of two populations when using at least one qualitative variable.

In the study discussed here, the responses to the demographic variables items on the Adult Education Administrator Personal Data Survey were assigned binary values for statistical analysis purposes.

CHAPTER 4
RESULTS

In this chapter is a discussion of the findings resulting from the analysis of the data of this study in accordance with the procedures described in Chapter 3. Table 4-1 presents the data on response rates.

Table 4-1

Response Rates

Group Variable	Number surveys mailed	Surveys returned		Usable responses						
		No.	%	No.			% of N			% of no. mailed to G
				F	M	G	F	M	G	
Leader	265	168	63.40	68	86	154	21.73	27.48	49.20	58.11
Nonleader	295	171	57.97	65	94	159	20.77	30.03	50.80	53.90
Aggregate data	560	339	60.54	133	180	313	42.49	57.51	100	55.89

Note: F = females. M = males. G = group of leaders or nonleaders. N = 313.

The data which were analyzed were obtained from the collected usable responses to the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire-Form XII (LBDQ-XII) and the Adult Education Administrator Personal Data Survey. The two instruments were sent to 265 peer-identified leaders and 295 nonleaders. As is shown in Table 4-1, of the 265 peer-identified leaders who were sent survey packets, 168 of them responded, for a 63.40%

return rate. Of those 168 responses, 14 were unusable; 154 were complete responses, resulting in a usable response rate of 58.11%. Of the 295 nonleaders who were sent survey packets, 171 of them responded, for a 57.97% return rate. Of the 171 returned, 12 were unusable; 159 were complete responses, resulting in a usable response rate of 53.90%. The overall usable response rate was 55.89%.

The data gleaned from the responses were subjected to discriminant function analysis to test the first hypothesis and its related subhypotheses; logistic regression analysis was applied to the data to test the second and third hypotheses and their related subhypotheses. The level of significance was set at .05, and the statistical analysis of the data was done using the Statistical Analysis System (SAS).

Hypothesis One

The first research question addressed in this study, expressed in two parts, asked (a) whether there was a difference between peer-identified leaders and nonleaders in the weighted linear combination of the 12 dimension scores of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire-Form XII (LBDQ-XII) and (b) which of the 12 dimension scores on the LBDQ-XII discriminated between peer-identified leaders and nonleaders. The related hypothesis and subhypotheses tested are listed here, with the pertinent statistical findings discussed separately with each of them.

There is no significant difference in the leader behavior of peer-identified leaders and nonleaders among selected Florida adult education administrators as measured by their scores on the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire-Form XII (LBDQ-XII).

The first hypothesis was not rejected at the .05 level of significance. Two tables display summary presentation of the data. Tables 4-2 presents the weighted linear composite scores of the leaders and nonleaders on the 12 dimension subscales. The table includes statistical significance calculations. The composite scores shown for each dimension variable are the result of the initial step in the application of the discriminant function analysis. The numbers listed represent those values which create the greatest difference or discrimination between the two groups, the leaders and nonleaders.

Once the greatest difference values were determined, the tests of significance were conducted. As shown in Table 4-2, no value falls below the .05 level. Only the Pr>F value for the dimension subscale Demand Reconciliation (0.0701) even closely approximates the .05 significance level. This proximity resulted in the decision to conduct additional analysis of the Demand Reconciliation dimension variable with regard to the four demographic variables of gender, age, educational attainment level, and employment circumstance.

Table 4-2

Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire-Form XII (LBDQ-XII) Composite Scores and Significance Values

LBDQ-XII dimension variable	Weighted linear composite score on subscales by group		F	Pr>F
	Leader*	Nonleader**		
Constant	-88.77416	-88.16603		
Representation	1.56627	1.51786	1.7787	0.1833
Demand Reconciliation	-0.81705	-0.89095	3.3028	0.0701
Tolerance for Uncertainty	1.30004	1.26832	1.4678	0.2266
Persuasion	0.47643	-0.45293	0.4180	0.5184
Initiation of Structure	0.82412	0.86234	0.7463	0.3883
Tolerance of Freedom	0.93823	0.99035	0.2990	0.5849
Role Assumption	0.75026	0.76737	0.9135	0.3403
Consideration	0.40804	0.42921	0.1922	0.6614
Production Emphasis	1.54243	1.52867	0.8242	0.3647
Predictive Accuracy	-0.00899	-0.07268	2.5379	0.1122
Integration	-3.33190	-3.39577	1.8827	0.1710
Superior Orientation	0.73659	0.73120	0.8689	0.3520

Note: *n = 154. **n = 159. N = 313.
$p < .05$.

Table 4-3 presents mean scores and standard deviation values for each of the 12 dimensions of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire-Form XII, listed by group (leader and nonleader) and sample population. These data were used to calculate the discriminant function scores which, in turn, were used to ascertain significant difference between the two groups.

Table 4-3

LBDQ-XII Mean and Standard Deviation Scores by Sample Population and Group

LBDQ-XII dimension variable	N (= 313)		Leader (n = 154)		Nonleader (n = 159)	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Representation	20.56230	2.66569	20.76623	2.19564	20.36478	3.04694
Demand Reconciliation	19.25559	3.41168	19.61039	2.94683	18.91195	3.78602
Tolerance for Uncertainty	34.12780	5.63326	34.51948	5.41267	33.74843	5.83092
Persuasion	38.93610	6.26158	39.16883	5.56695	38.71069	6.87809
Initiation of Structure	39.95208	5.54419	40.22727	4.66880	39.68553	6.28051
Tolerance of Freedom	39.85942	5.85504	39.67532	5.22048	40.03774	6.42177
Role Assumption	38.37380	5.72871	38.68831	5.05851	38.06918	6.31165
Consideration of Others	38.44728	6.21242	38.60390	5.47653	38.29560	6.86447
Production Emphasis	34.89776	5.07278	35.16234	4.92356	34.64151	5.21595
Predictive Accuracy	18.77316	2.98334	19.04545	2.67484	18.50943	3.24109
Integration	19.04153	4.01059	19.35714	3.45594	18.73585	4.47278
Superior Orientation	38.68371	4.93668	38.94805	4.14570	38.42767	5.59889

$p < .05$.

Even though no significant difference was found between leaders and nonleaders, it should be noted that the mean dimension scores of the leaders were higher than those of the nonleaders on all dimensions except Tolerance of Freedom, which had the second lowest difference among the 12. The differences in mean scores ranged from 0.3083 to 0.77105.

Table 4-4 presents the mean scores on the LBDQ-XII grouped by gender. While there were no significant differences found, it may be useful to briefly review the very slight differences between the two subgroups.

Table 4-4

LBDQ-XII Mean and Standard Deviation Scores by Gender

LBDQ-XII dimension variable	Gender			
	Female (n = 133)		Male (n = 180)	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Representation	20.52	3.19	20.45	2.65
Demand Reconciliation	19.21	3.41	19.31	3.44
Tolerance for Uncertainty	34.41	5.97	33.83	5.45
Persuasion	39.66	6.64	38.81	5.98
Initiation of Structure	39.66	6.14	40.19	5.09
Tolerance of Freedom	40.18	6.00	39.64	5.76
Role Assumption	38.40	6.22	38.38	5.33
Consideration of Others	38.40	6.44	38.49	6.07
Production Emphasis	34.47	6.44	35.25	4.81
Predictive Accuracy	18.64	3.19	18.97	3.16
Integration	18.74	4.38	19.26	3.71
Superior Orientation	38.68	5.24	38.54	4.85

Note: N = 313.

The females scored slightly higher than the males on 7 of the 12 dimensions: Representation, Tolerance for Uncertainty, Persuasion, Tolerance of Freedom, Role Assumption, Production Emphasis, and Superior Orientation. Males scored higher on 5 of the 12 dimensions: Demand

Reconciliation, Initiation of Structure, Consideration of Others, Predictive Accuracy, and Integration.

Subhypothesis One

There is no significant difference between peer-identified leaders and nonleaders among selected Florida adult education administrators in the degree to which they speak and act as representatives of a group as measured by their Representation subscale scores on the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire-Form XII (LBDQ-XII). The first subhypothesis was tested at the .05 level of significance, and no significant difference was found in the scores. On the basis of the statistical finding, the first subhypothesis was not rejected. A summary presentation of the data can be found in Tables 4-2 and 4-3. As is shown in Table 4-3, the leaders' and nonleaders' mean scores on the Representation dimension subscale were 20.76623 and 20.36478, respectively, for a difference of 0.40145. Since $F = 1.77$ and $Pr>F = 0.1833$ (see Table 4-2), there was no statistically significant difference between the degree to which the leaders and nonleaders behave as spokespersons for their subordinates.

Subhypothesis Two

There is no significant difference between peer-identified leaders and nonleaders among selected Florida adult education administrators in the degree to which they reconcile conflicting demands and reduce disorder to the system as measured by their Demand Reconciliation subscale scores on

the LBDQ-XII. The second subhypothesis was tested at the .05 level of significance, and no significant difference was found. On the basis of the statistical finding, the second subhypothesis was not rejected. A summary presentation of the data can be found in Tables 4-2 and 4-3. As presented in Table 4-3, the mean scores of the leaders and nonleaders on the Demand Reconciliation dimension subscale were 19.61039 and 18.91195, respectively. The difference between the two scores was 0.69844, which was the second highest among the score differences. As shown in Table 4-2, this dimension subscale's values, $F = 3.3028$ and $Pr > F = 0.0701$, indicated no significant difference and were distinctly different from the other 11 dimensions. Their notably greater proximity to the predetermined significance value was such that the decision was made to use the groups' scores on this dimension to conduct further analysis of the leader behavior of the leaders and nonleaders using logistic regression analysis and the four demographic variables. Further investigation was done to explore the difference in the way the two groups handled complex and often conflicting demands of the job.

Twelve dimensions of leader behavior are represented in the 100 statements on the LBDQ-XII. Eight of the dimensions are measured through the calculation of the responses to the ten statements developed for each dimension. Four of the dimensions--Representation, Predictive Accuracy, Integration, and Demand Reconciliation--are measured by calculating the

values of the responses to five questions. The five statements on the LBDQ-XII, as shown in Appendix B, that are designed to gather information about the Demand Reconciliation dimension of leader behavior are (a) handles complex problems efficiently, (b) gets swamped by details, (c) gets things all tangled up, (d) can reduce a madhouse to system and order, and (e) gets confused when too many demands are made of him/her (Stogdill, 1963). It should be noted that the second (b), third (c), and fifth (e) statements are scored in reverse order from the other two because of the opposite approach in the statement of the behavior example. These five aspects of Demand Reconciliation address the administrative responsibilities of problem solving, managing large quantities of detail, prioritizing one's time, and handling pressure. The importance of and need for behaviors that demonstrate having these skills is well documented in the literature. In addition to the attestations of Jarvie, Black, and Brahce (1964); Griffith (1969); Maxson and Sistrunk (1973); and Mason (1991) about the complexities of the job of leading adult education programs, the research reported here seems to further lend strength to the idea of the importance of having leaders whose behavior results in effective orchestration of the many and complex responsibilities of operating successful instructional programs for adult learners. Thus, the decision was made to study the data further. The discussion of the result of testing the third hypothesis will indicate the findings of the additional analysis.

Subhypothesis Three

There is no significant difference between peer-identified leaders and nonleaders among selected Florida adult education administrators in the degree to which they are able to tolerate uncertainty and postponement without anxiety as measured by their Tolerance for Uncertainty subscale scores on the LBDQ-XII. The third subhypothesis was tested at the .05 level of significance, and no significant difference was found. On the basis of the statistical finding, the third subhypothesis was not rejected. A summary presentation of the data can be found in Tables 4-2 and 4-3. As shown in Table 4-3, the leaders' and nonleaders' mean scores on the Tolerance for Uncertainty dimension subscale were 34.51948 and 33.74843, respectively. The difference between the means was 0.77105, which was the largest difference found among the group means among the 12 dimensions. Table 4-3 shows that $F = 1.4678$ and $Pr>F = 0.2266$ for this dimension. Since no statistically significant difference was found between the two groups in terms of their patience and self-assurance in the face of delays, change, and innovation, this dimension was not used when conducting logistic regression analysis using the demographic variables in order to test the third hypothesis.

Subhypothesis Four

There is no significant difference between peer-identified leaders and nonleaders among selected Florida adult education administrators in the

degree to which they use persuasion and argument effectively and exhibit strong convictions as measured by their Persuasion subscale scores on the LBDQ-XII. The fourth subhypothesis was tested at the .05 level of significance, and no significant difference was found. On the basis of the statistical finding, the fourth subhypothesis was not rejected. A summary presentation of the data can be found in Tables 4-2 and 4-3. The mean scores of the leaders and nonleaders on the Persuasion dimension subscale were 39.16883 and 38.71069, respectively (see Table 4-3). The difference between the two means was 0.45814, one of the smallest differences found. As can be seen in Table 4-2, $F = 0.4180$ and $Pr>F = 0.5184$. No further analysis was done regarding the degree to which leaders and nonleaders were persuasive advocates for their issues and positions.

Subhypothesis Five

There is no significant difference between peer-identified leaders and nonleaders among selected Florida adult education administrators in the degree to which they clearly define their own role and let followers know what is expected of them as measured by their Initiation of Structure subscale scores on the LBDQ-XII. The fifth subhypothesis was tested at the .05 level of significance, and no significant difference was found. On the basis of the statistical finding, the fifth subhypothesis was not rejected. A summary presentation of the data can be found in Tables 4-2 and 4-3. As indicated in Table 4-3, the mean scores for leaders and nonleaders on the

Initiation of Structure dimension subscale were 40.22727 and 39.68553, respectively. The difference between the two means was 0.54174. According to the statistics listed in Table 4-2, F = 0.7463 and Pr>F = 0.3883. The resultant finding of no significant difference between the two groups on the subscale eliminates the dimension from use with the four demographics in logistic regression analysis.

Subhypothesis Six

There is no significant difference between peer-identified leaders and nonleaders among selected Florida adult education administrators in the degree to which they allow followers scope for initiative, decision making, and action as measured by their Tolerance of Freedom subscale scores on the LBDQ-XII. The sixth subhypothesis was tested at the .05 level of significance, and no significant difference was found. On the basis of the statistical finding, the sixth subhypothesis was not rejected. A summary presentation of the data can be found in Tables 4-2 and 4-3. The mean scores of the leaders and nonleaders on the Tolerance of Freedom dimension subscale were 39.67532 and 40.03774, respectively (see Table 4-3). This was the only dimension on which the nonleaders scored higher than the leaders, though not significantly so. The score difference of 0.36242 was the second lowest among the mean score differences. As shown in Table 4-2, F = 0.2990 and Pr>F=0.5849. Because the subhypothesis was not rejected, the Tolerance of Freedom dimension subscale was not used with

the demographic variables to further analyze the degree to which the leaders and nonleaders gave followers the freedom to do their jobs and demonstrate initiative.

Subhypothesis Seven

There is no significant difference between peer-identified leaders and nonleaders among selected Florida adult education administrators in the degree to which they actively exercise the leadership role, rather than surrender leadership to others, as measured by their Role Assumption subscale scores on the LBDQ-XII. The seventh subhypothesis was tested at the .05 level of significance, and no significant difference was found in the scores. On the basis of the statistical finding, the seventh subhypothesis was not rejected. A summary presentation of the data can be found in Tables 4-2 and 4-3. For the Role Assumption dimension subscale, the leaders' mean score was 38.68831 and the nonleaders' was 38.06918 (see Table 4-3). The difference between the two means was 0.61913. As can be seen in Table 4-2, $F = 0.9135$ and $Pr>F = 0.3399$. The absence of significant difference between the two groups in the degree to which they embraced and performed the duties of leadership resulted in the elimination of this dimension subscale from further analysis.

Subhypothesis Eight

There is no significant difference between peer-identified leaders and nonleaders among selected Florida adult education administrators in the

degree to which they regard the comfort, well-being, status, and contribution of followers as measured by their Consideration of Others subscale scores on the LBDQ-XII. The eighth subhypothesis was tested at the .05 level of significance, and no significant difference was found. On the basis of the statistical finding, the eighth subhypothesis was not rejected. A summary presentation of the data can be found in Tables 4-2 and 4-3. The leaders' and nonleaders' mean scores on the Consideration of Others dimension subscale were 38.60390 and 38.29560, respectively (see Table 4-3). The mean scores difference of 0.3083 is the smallest among the 12 dimensions. As shown in Table 4-2, $F = 0.1922$ and $Pr>F = 0.6614$, thereby indicating the absence of significant difference between the two groups in terms of the degree to which they are sensitive to and respectful of their followers' needs, feelings, and ideas. The Consideration of Others dimension subscale scores were not subjected to logistic regression analysis for the purpose of answering the third research question and testing the third hypothesis.

Subhypothesis Nine

There is no significant difference between peer-identified leaders and nonleaders among selected Florida adult education administrators in the degree to which they apply pressure for productive output as measured by their Production Emphasis subscale scores on the LBDQ-XII. The ninth subhypothesis was tested at the .05 level of significance, and no significant

difference was found. On the basis of the statistical finding, the ninth subhypothesis was not rejected. A summary presentation of the data can be found in Tables 4-2 and 4-3. As shown in Table 4-3, the leaders' and nonleaders' mean scores on the Production Emphasis dimension subscale were 35.16234 and 34.64151, respectively. The difference between the means was 0.52083. Because F = 0.8242 and Pr>F = 0.3647 (see Table 4-2), logistic regression analysis was not conducted using the Production Emphasis dimension subscale scores with the demographic variables.

Subhypothesis Ten

There is no significant difference between peer-identified leaders and nonleaders among selected Florida adult education administrators in the degree to which they exhibit foresight and ability to predict outcomes accurately as measured by their Predictive Accuracy subscale scores on the LBDQ-XII. The tenth subhypothesis was tested at the .05 level of significance, and no significant difference was found. On the basis of the statistical finding, the tenth subhypothesis was not rejected. A summary presentation of the data can be found in Tables 4-2 and 4-3. The mean scores for the leaders and nonleaders on the Predictive Accuracy dimension subscale were 19.04545 and 18.50943, respectively (see Table 4-3). The difference between the means was 0.53602. As can be seen in Table 4-2, F = 2.5379 and Pr>F = 0.1122. Because no significant difference was found between the two groups in terms of how accurately they perceived

the issues and forecasted the trends related to their programs, the scores associated with the Predictive Accuracy dimension subscale were not included in logistic regression analysis with the demographic variables.

Subhypothesis Eleven

There is no significant difference between peer-identified leaders and nonleaders among selected Florida adult education administrators in the degree to which they maintain a closely knit organization and resolve intermember conflict as measured by their Integration subscale scores on the LBDQ-XII. The eleventh subhypothesis was tested at the .05 level of significance, and no significant difference was found. On the basis of the statistical finding, the eleventh subhypothesis was not rejected. A summary presentation of the data can be found in Tables 4-2 and 4-3. On the Integration dimension subscale, the leaders' mean score was 19.35714, and the nonleaders' mean score was 18.73585, as shown in Table 4-3. The difference between the means was 0.62129. Because $F = 1.8827$ and $Pr>F = 0.1710$ (see Table 4-2), which indicated that there is no significant difference between the two groups in the degree to which they effected group cohesion, the Integration dimension subscale scores were not appropriate for use with the demographic variables in logistic regression analysis.

Subhypothesis Twelve

There is no significant difference between peer-identified leaders and nonleaders among selected Florida adult education administrators in the degree to which they maintain cordial relations with superiors, have influence over them, and strive for higher status as measured by their Superior Orientation subscale scores on the LBDQ-XII. The twelfth subhypothesis was tested at the .05 level of significance, and no significant difference was found. On the basis of the statistical finding, the twelfth subhypothesis was not rejected. A summary presentation of the data can be found in Tables 4-2 and 4-3. As is shown in Table 4-3, the leaders and nonleaders scored means of 38.94805 and 38.42767, respectively. The difference between the two means was 0.52038. Because $F = 0.8689$ and $Pr > F = 0.3520$ (see Table 4-2), it was determined not to use the Superior Orientation dimension subscale scores with the demographic variables in a logistic regression analysis. There was no significant difference between the two groups in the degree to which they were successful with their superordinates for their own professional benefit and for their programs.

The objective in testing the first hypothesis and its 12 subhypotheses was to ascertain if there was a difference between peer-identified leaders and nonleaders among Florida adult education administrators based on their scores on the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire-Form XII, taking into consideration all 12 of its dimensions.

The results of the test of the first hypothesis allowed the determination of the answers to research questions 1(a) and 1(b). As has been discussed, neither the first hypothesis nor any of its subhypotheses were rejected at the .05 level of significance. As a result of the analysis of the first research question, it was determined that the answer to the first part of the first research question was that there was no significant difference between the peer-identified leaders and nonleaders in the weighted linear combination of the 12 dimension scores of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire-Form XII.

The focus of the second part of the first research question was on which of the 12 dimensions of the LBDQ-XII discriminate between peer-identified leaders and nonleaders among Florida adult education administrators. Because the statistical analysis of the subscale scores on the LBDQ-XII using the .05 level of significance indicated no significant differences in the subscale scores of the leaders and nonleaders, the answer to the research question was that none of the dimensions discriminated between leaders and nonleaders.

The third research question to be answered by this investigation was whether or not there was a difference between the leaders and nonleaders in terms of four demographic variables and any LBDQ-XII dimension scores found to be significantly different between the two groups when testing the first hypothesis and its 12 subhypotheses. Because no statistically

significant differences were found between the dimension subscale mean scores of leaders and nonleaders when testing the first hypothesis, the third research question would by default require a negative answer. It should be noted that in Table 4-2 that the F scores seem to fall into three distinct groups of valuation: 0 through .9999, between 1.0000 and 2.0000, and 2.0100 through 3.3028. The corresponding Pr>F values proportionally clustered distinctly with value groupings of less than 0.2, between 0.21 and 0.35, and more than 0.5. The probability value of 0.0701 for the Demand Reconciliation dimension of the LBDQ-XII was notably different from the other 11 scores and was comparatively quite close to the .05 significance level parameter set before data analysis began; its corresponding F value of 3.3028 was notably higher than the other 11 values. Because the scores of this particular subscale were so distinct from the others, particularly with a Pr>F value so close to the .05 qualifier, further analysis appeared to be a warranted and responsible investigative step. Thus, the discussion regarding the third hypothesis and related subhypotheses was predicated on that additional analysis of the data using the LBDQ-XII dimension Demand Reconciliation subscale scores as shown in Table 4-2 for the reasons presented. It must be reiterated that the second subhypothesis, relating to the Demand Reconciliation dimension of the LBDQ-XII, was not rejected because the scores were not significantly different at the .05 level. Despite this fact and for the reasons stated above, that dimension subscale score

was used to test the third hypothesis in order to attempt to answer the third research question of this study.

Hypothesis Two

The second question of this study asked if there was a difference between the leaders and nonleaders in the weighted linear combination of four selected demographic variables. In order to answer the question, the following hypothesis and four subhypotheses were tested. A discussion of the findings accompanies each hypothetical statement.

There is no significant difference between peer-identified leaders and nonleaders among selected Florida adult education administrators based on the demographic variables of age, gender, educational attainment level, and employment circumstance (employed by a community college with sole responsibility for adult education, employed by a school district with sole responsibility for adult education, employed by a community college with shared responsibility for adult education, employed by a school district with shared responsibility for adult education, or neither). The second hypothesis was tested at the .05 level of significance, and a significant difference was found in the scores in two of the employment circumstances: employment in a school system with shared responsibility for adult education and employment in a community college with shared responsibility for adult education programs. On the basis of the statistical finding, the second

hypothesis was rejected. A summary presentation of the findings can be seen in Table 4-5.

The statistical procedure used to test both the second and third hypotheses was logistic regression analysis. Rather than execute one analysis for the demographic variables and then a second and separate one which included both the demographic variables and the leader behavior dimension Demand Reconciliation scores for both groups, the decision was made to conduct a combined analysis. The combined calculation yields stronger results because it accounts for continuous independent variables and embeds statistical controls in the technique which result in very highly defined differences among any that are discovered (Preston & Wilson, 1978). A discussion of each related subhypothesis is presented here. The statistics referenced regarding each variable are presented in Table 4-5.

Subhypothesis One

There is no significant difference between peer-identified leaders and nonleaders among selected Florida adult education administrators based on age. This subhypothesis was tested at the .05 level of significance, and no significant difference was found in the scores. On the basis of the statistical finding, the first subhypothesis was not rejected. As shown in Table 4-5, Wald Chi-Square = 0.1318 and Pr>Chi-Square = 0.7166, which indicated no significant difference between the two groups with regard to age.

Table 4-5

Logistic Regression Analysis of the Demand Reconciliation Dimension and Demographic Variables Scores

Variable	Wald Chi-Square	Pr > Chi-Square	Parameter Estimate
Intercept	0.0173	0.8953	0.2219
Demand Reconciliation	5.8492	0.0156	-0.0889
Age	0.1318	0.7166	-0.00666
Gender	0.8547	0.3552	0.2371
AA/AS	2.4082	0.1207	2.6713
BA/BS	3.5219	0.0606	2.6526
MM/MS	0.4865	0.4855	0.8781
EdS	0.4264	0.5138	0.8771
PhD/EdD	0.0447	0.8325	0.2728
S/Sole	2.7560	0.0969	0.7348
S/Shared	8.8963	0.0029	1.4133
CC/Sole	0.5835	0.4449	0.4299
CC/Shared	5.7414	0.0166	1.3509

Note: S/Sole = school system with sole responsibility for adult education programs. S/Shared = school system with shared responsibility for adult education programs. CC/Sole = community college with sole responsibility for adult education programs. CC/Shared = community college with shared responsibility for adult education programs.
N = 313.
$p < .05$. df = 1.

Subhypothesis Two

There is no significant difference between peer-identified leaders and nonleaders among selected Florida adult education administrators based on gender. This subhypothesis was tested at the .05 level of significance, and

no significant difference was found. On the basis of the statistical finding, the second subhypothesis was not rejected. As shown in Table 4-5, the value for Wald Chi-Square = 0.8547 and for Pr>Chi-Square = 0.3552, indicating no significant difference between the two groups based on their gender.

Subhypothesis Three

There is no significant difference between peer-identified leaders and nonleaders among selected Florida adult education administrators based on educational attainment level. This subhypothesis was tested at the .05 level of significance, and no significant difference was found. On the basis of the statistical finding, the third subhypothesis was not rejected.

As can be seen in Table 4-5, the Wald Chi-Square calculation for those respondents whose highest educational level was an Associate's degree (AA/AS) was 2.4082 and the corresponding Pr>Chi-Square value was found to be 0.1207; these values indicated no significant difference between the leaders and nonleaders whose highest education level was the AA/AS. The Wald Chi-Square and Pr>Chi-Square values for those respondents whose highest earned degree was the Bachelor's degree were 3.5219 and 0.0606, respectively. For those respondents whose highest level of education was the Master's degree, the Wald Chi-Square and Pr>Chi-Square values were 0.4865 and 0.4855, respectively. Calculation of the data supplied by the respondents who reported having the Specialist

in Education degree resulted in significance values of 0.4264 and 0.5138 for Wald Chi-Square and Pr > Chi-Square, respectively; these values attested to the absence of significant difference between the two groups. For those respondents who reported that they have doctorates, the Wald Chi-Square calculation was 0.0447 and for the Pr > Chi-Square, 0.8325, indicating no significant difference between leaders and nonleaders in terms of having a doctorate.

Subhypothesis Four

There is no significant difference between peer-identified leaders and nonleaders among selected Florida adult education administrators based on employment circumstance (employed by a community college with sole responsibility for adult education, employed by a school district with sole responsibility for adult education, employed by a community college with shared responsibility for adult education, employed by a school district with shared responsibility for adult education, or neither). This subhypothesis was tested at the .05 level of significance, and a significant difference was found. On the basis of the statistical finding, the fourth subhypothesis was rejected. A summary presentation of the data can be found in Table 4-5.

As shown in Table 4-5, a Wald Chi-Square value of 8.8963 and Pr > Chi-Square value of 0.0029 resulted from logistic regression analysis of the data gathered from those respondents who worked in school districts in which the responsibility for operating adult education was shared with

another educational entity. For the scores of the respondents who worked in community colleges which shared with another educational provider the responsibility for operation adult education programs, it was found that Wald Chi-Square = 5.7414 and Pr>Chi-Square = 0.0166. These values indicated significant difference between the leaders and nonleaders on the LBDQ-XII based on their employment circumstance.

Hypothesis Three

The third research question of the study asked if there was a difference between the leaders and nonleaders in the weighted linear combination of selected LBDQ-XII dimension scores when controlling for selected demographic variables. In order to answer the question, the following hypothesis was tested. There is no significant difference between peer-identified leaders and nonleaders among selected Florida adult education administrators in the weighted linear combination of selected LBDQ-XII dimension scores as determined in the analysis of Ho_1, controlling for the demographic variables of age, gender, educational attainment level, and employment circumstance (employed by a community college with sole responsibility for adult education, employed by a school district with sole responsibility for adult education, employed by a community college with shared responsibility for adult education, employed by a school district with shared responsibility for adult education, or neither). This third hypothesis was tested at the .05 level of significance, and a significant difference was

found with regard to the employment circumstance variable. On the basis of the statistical finding, the third hypothesis was rejected. A summary presentation of the data can be found in Table 4-5.

Examination of how the demographic variables related to the Demand Reconciliation dimension subscale of the LBDQ-XII was accomplished using logistic regression analysis, which mathematically relates the probability of an event occurring (the tendency to leader behavior in the area of Demand Reconciliation) on a vector of explanatory variables (age, gender, educational attainment level, and employment circumstance). As can be seen in Table 4-5, neither age nor gender appeared to affect the degree of leader behavior exhibited in the area of Demand Reconciliation. None of the educational attainment levels significantly affected the degree of leader behavior in terms of Demand Reconciliation; however, the fact that Pr>Chi-Square = 0.0606 is worthy of some comment because its relative proximity to the .05 significance level suggested that the scores of those subjects whose highest educational attainment level was a Bachelor's degree came closer to showing effect than did those associated with the other educational levels included, even though not significantly so.

The only variable that seemed to have a statistically significant relationship to the distinction between leaders and nonleaders with respect to Demand Reconciliation was employment circumstance, specifically among those respondents who worked in a school district or community college

which shared with other education providers the responsibility for adult education programs. The values Wald Chi-Square = 8.8963 and Pr>Chi-Square = 0.0029, for responses of those administrators who worked in school districts with shared responsibility for adult education programs, were significant. The statistics indicated that working in that particular circumstance seemed to have some relationship with the degree to which leaders evidenced the leader behavior Demand Reconciliation, which involves reconciling conflict and reducing disorder to the system. As shown in Table 4-5, the findings of Wald Chi-Square = 5.7414 and Pr>F = 0.0166 indicated significant difference between leaders and nonleaders who worked in community colleges with shared responsibility for adult education programs. These statistics indicated a relationship between working in a shared responsibility circumstance and the degree to which Demand Reconciliation behavior was exhibited.

Adult Education Administrator Personal Data Survey Information

As has been discussed, there was no difference found between the groups with regard to three of the four demographic variables: age, gender, and educational attainment level. Significant differences were found in the two components of the employment circumstance variable in which the respondents worked in school districts or community colleges with shared responsibility for adult education programs. Despite the fact that significant difference was evident in only one demographic variable, useful descriptive

information about the characteristics of adult education administrators may be gathered from a comparative review of all four demographic variables.

Collecting demographic information from the research subjects using the Adult Education Administrator Personal Data Survey was done in order to secure information regarding each adult education administrator's age, gender, educational attainment level, and employment circumstance. Their responses yielded useful data that served a critical purpose in the statistical analysis conducted to test the stated research hypotheses and subhypotheses. The information garnered also provided statistics useful in analyzing the characteristics of adult education administrators working in Florida at the time this research was done. A copy of the Adult Education Administrator Survey is included as Appendix A.

As shown in Table 4-1, there were 154 respondents who were peer-identified leaders and 159 who were nonleaders, with respective population representation rates of 49.20% and 50.80%. Females comprised 42.49% of the sample, numbering 133; the male respondents, 180 in number, represented 57.51% of the sample population. The distributions by group and gender were somewhat even: 21.73% were female leaders, 27.48% were male leaders, 20.77% were female nonleaders, and 30.03% were male nonleaders (see Table 4-1).

Age

Tables 4-6 and 4-7 provide summary data on the demographic variable of age. The average age of the 313 respondents was 48.75 years, with a minimum age of 29 and a maximum age of 67 (see Table 4-6). The 154 peer-identified leaders had an average age of 49.13 years, with a minimum age of 30 and a maximum age of 67. The 159 nonleader respondents' average age was 48.38; the minimum age was 29 and the maximum was 63.

Table 4-6

Age Statistics by Group and Sample Population

Group	Mean	SD	Range
Leaders: n = 154	49.13	6.67	30 - 67
Nonleaders: n = 159	48.37	6.96	29 - 63
Females: n = 133	47.53	6.87	30 - 65
Males: n = 180	49.65	6.66	29 - 67
Sample Population: N = 313	48.75	6.82	29 - 67

Table 4-7 includes age distribution information regarding the sample population. As shown in Table 4-7, 154 respondents were between the ages of 40 and 49 and represented 49.20% of the 313 respondents. The next largest group of respondents included those between the ages of 50 and 59; they numbered 116, for 37.06% of the sample population. Only one respondent was under the age of 30. Those in their 30s and in their 60s comprised similar size groups, numbering 19 and 23, respectively.

Table 4-7

Age Distribution by Decades

Age Range	Number	Percentage of N
0-29	1	.30
30-39	19	6.07
40-49	154	49.20
50-59	116	37.06
60-69	23	7.35

Note: N = 313.

Gender

Statistics regarding the gender composition of the two groups and the sample population are reported in Table 4-8. There was a notably even distribution between leaders and nonleaders in terms of gender. As indicated in Table 4-8, 133, or 42.49%, of the respondents were females and 180, or 57.51%, of the respondents were males. Among the females, 51.13% were leaders and 48.87% were nonleaders; among the males, the percentages were 47.78% and 52.22%, respectively. Of the nonleaders, 40.88% were females, while 59.12% were males; of the nonleaders, 44.16% were females and 55.84% were males. Of the women who responded, 51.13% were peer-identified leaders and 48.87% were nonleaders.

Table 4-8

Gender Statistics by Group, Subgroup, and Sample Population

Group	Gender	Number	% of sample	% by gender	% by group
Leader (n = 154)	Female	68	21.73	51.13	44.16
	Male	86	27.48	47.78	55.84
Nonleaders (n = 159)	Female	65	20.77	48.87	40.88
	Male	94	30.03	52.22	59.12
Sample Population (N = 313)	Female	133	42.49		
	Male	180	57.51		

Among the male respondents, 47.78% were peer-identified leaders and 52.22% were nonleaders. When considering the sample population as a whole, 20.77% were female nonleaders, 21.73% were female leaders, 30.03% were male nonleaders, and 27.48% were male leaders.

Educational Attainment Level

Based on the statistics shown in Table 4-9, the majority (93.29%) of the responding adult education administrators had advanced degrees. Nearly one in five (19.49%) of the respondents had completed a doctorate; 65% more leaders than nonleaders indicated having acquired that credential (38 compared with 23). This category represented the second largest subgroup in the sample in terms of educational attainment level. Their mean age was 50.79, which was the highest when considering level of education. Of the 61 respondents in the subgroup, 62.30% were leaders and 37.70% were nonleaders.

Table 4-9

Educational Attainment Level and Mean Age by Group and Sample Population

Group	Data Parameter	AA/ AS	BA/ BS	MA/ MS	EdS	EdD/ PhD	Other Professional
Nonleader (n = 159)	number	3	14	109	9	23	1
	% of total sample population	0.96	4.47	34.82	2.88	7.35	0.32
	% of holders of degree type	75.00	82.35	52.15	47.37	37.70	33.33
Leader (n = 154)	number	1	3	100	10	38	2
	% of total sample population	.32	0.96	31.95	3.19	12.14	0.64
	% of holders of degree type	25.00	17.65	47.85	52.63	62.30	66.67
Sample Population (N = 313)	number	4	17	209	19	61	3
	% of total sample population	1.28	5.43	66.77	6.07	19.49	0.96
	Mean age	40.50	44.00	48.59	50.63	50.79	44.33

Those respondents whose highest level of education was a Specialist in Education degree composed 6.07% of the sample population, numbering 19; 10 of them were leaders, and 9 of them were nonleaders. The mean age for this subgroup was 50.63.

Two-thirds (66.77%) of the respondents reported that the highest degree earned was a Master's degree. Of that subgroup, 100 were leaders

and 109 were nonleaders. The mean age for those with the Master's degree was 48.59.

The number of respondents whose highest educational attainment level was a Bachelor's degree was 17, representing 5.43% of the sample population. Of those 17, 3 were leaders and 14 were nonleaders. The mean age for this subgroup was 44.

Four respondents reported the Associate's degree as their highest degree earned, representing 1.28% of the sample population. Three of those respondents were nonleaders and one was a leader. The mean age of this subgroup was 40.50.

The respondents who reported having another type of professional degree, (such as a degree in medicine, dentistry, or law) as their highest degree represented only .96% of the sample population, numbering 3. As shown in Table 4-9, two of them were leaders, and the other was a nonleader.

More nonleaders reported one of the three lower level degrees listed as the highest degree earned than did leaders, while more leaders than nonleaders reported having a Specialist in Education degree, doctorate, or other professional degree (M.D., D.D.S., or J.D., for example).

Table 4-10 present statistics on educational attainment in terms of gender. Of the 17 respondents whose highest educational attainment level

was a Bachelor's degree, 76.47% were female (representing 9.77% of the gender subgroup) and 23.53% were males, or 2.22% of that gender subgroup. Of those 209 respondents for whom the highest degree held was

Tables 4-10

Educational Attainment Level by Gender

Educational Attainment Variable	Female (n = 133)			Male (n = 180)		
	No.	% of gender	% of EAL	No.	% of gender	% of EAL
AA/AS	3	2.26	75.00	1	0.56	25.00
BA/BS	13	9.77	76.47	4	2.22	23.53
MA/MS	85	63.91	40.67	124	68.89	59.33
EdS	4	3.01	21.05	15	8.33	78.95
PhD/EdD	27	20.30	44.26	34	18.89	55.74
Other Professional	1	0.75	33.33	2	1.11	66.67

Note: EAL = educational attainment level. N = 313.

a Master's degree, 40.67% of them were females and 59.33% of them were males. These numbers represented 63.91% of the females in the sample and 68.89% of the males. The respondent subgroup with a Specialist in Education degree was comprised of 78.95% males and 21.05% females and composed 8.33% and 3.01% of their respective gender subgroups. Of the 61 people whose highest degree was a doctorate, 44.26% of them were females, and 55.74% of them were males. The percentages for their respective gender subgroups were 20.30 and 18.89.

Employment Circumstance

There were five possible responses to the question on the Adult Education Administrator Personal Data Survey regarding employment circumstance: employment with a school district which has sole responsibility for adult education programs, employment with a school district which shares with other educational entities responsibility for adult education programs, employment at a community college which has sole responsibility for adult education programs, employment at a community college which shares with other educational entities responsibility for adult education programs, and employment with neither a school district nor a community college.

As can be seen in Table 4-11, the largest single respondent category included leaders who worked in a school district with sole responsibility for adult education, representing 23% of the respondent population. The next largest category included nonleaders who worked in a school district with sole responsibility for adult education, representing 20.13% of the sample population. Respondents who worked in school districts with shared responsibility composed the third largest sample population segment, with nonleaders at 16.29% and leaders at 8.95% for a combined sample population representation of 25.24%. Those leaders who worked in community colleges with sole responsibility for adult education represented

6.39% of the sample population, and the corresponding nonleaders' percentage was 5.75. Those adult education administrators who were named leaders who worked in community colleges which share the responsibility for adult education programs represented 4.15% of the sample population; their nonleader counterparts represented 5.43%.

Table 4-11

Employment Circumstance by Group and Sample Population

Group	Data Parameter	S/Sole	S/Shared	CC/Sole	CC/Shared	Neither
Nonleader (n = 159)	number	63	51	18	17	10
	% of employment category	46.67	64.56	47.37	56.67	32.26
	% of group	39.62	32.08	11.32	10.69	6.29
	% of N	20.13	16.29	5.75	5.43	3.19
Leader (n = 154)	number	72	28	20	13	21
	% of employment category	53.33	35.44	52.63	43.33	67.74
	% of group	46.75	18.18	12.99	8.44	13.64
	% of N	23.00	8.95	6.39	4.15	6.71
Subjects in Employment Category	number	135	79	38	30	31
	% of N	43.13	25.24	12.14	9.58	9.90

Note: N=313.

The respondents whose employment was with an educational entity other than a school district or community college represented 9.90% of the sample population; in that subgroup, there were twice as many leaders as nonleaders responding: 21 versus 10.

Table 4-12 provides information about which administrators, in terms of the type of degree held, worked in which employment settings. The single largest subgroup was comprised of those respondents (n = 91) with a Master's degree (MA/MS) who worked in school districts with sole

Table 4-12

Employment Circumstance by Educational Attainment Level

Employment Circumstance Variable	AA/ AS	BA/ BS	MA/ MS	EdS	PhD/ EdD	Other Professional	Totals
S/Sole	2	6	91	14	24	1	135
S/Shared	2	3	64	3	5	1	79
CC/Sole	2	0	22	0	5	1	38
CC/Shared	2	6	15	0	24	0	30
Neither	1	1	17	2	10	0	31
Totals	4	17	209	19	61	3	N=313

responsibility for providing adult education programs. The next largest subgroup was composed of those with a Master's degree who worked in a school district with shared responsibility for adult education (n = 64).

Twenty-four of the 61 administrators with a doctorate (PhD/EdD) worked in school districts with sole responsibility for adult education programs. Of those 19 respondents with a Specialist in Education degree (EdS), the majority of them (14) were employed in a school district with sole responsibility for adult education. Over half (n = 9) of the 17 people with a

Bachelor's degree worked in a community college with sole responsibility for adult education programs.

No respondent with an Associate's (AA/AS), Specialist in Education, or other professional degree and only one subject with a Bachelor's degree was employed in a community college with shared responsibility for adult education programs. Of the 38 respondents who worked in a community college with sole responsibility for adult education programs, 22 of them reported a Master's degree as their highest level of educational attainment.

Statistics regarding gender with respect to employment circumstance are provided in Table 4-13. Fifty-one females, comprising the largest number of that gender subgroup, were employed in a school district with sole responsibility for adult education programs; the corresponding percentage was 38.35. The second largest component of the female gender subgroup worked in a community college with sole responsibility for adult education ($n = 31$). In contrast, among the males, the largest number of that gender subgroup were employed in a school system; only 13.78% of the responding males worked in a community college.

Of those respondents who worked in a community college with sole responsibility for adult education, 81.58% of them were females. There was a more even gender distribution among the respondents who worked in a community college with shared responsibility for adult education, with 14 females and 16 males reported. Males outnumbered females by nearly two

to one among those working in settings other than a school district or a community college (67.74% as compared with 32.26%, respectively).

Table 4-13

Employment Circumstance by Gender

Employment Circumstance Variable	Female (n = 133)			Male 9 (n = 180)		
	No.	% of gender	% of EC	No.	% of gender	% of EC
School/Sole	51	38.35	37.78	84	46.67	62.22
School/Shared	27	20.30	34.18	52	28.39	65.82
CC/Sole	31	23.31	81.58	7	3.89	18.42
CC/Shared	14	10.53	46.67	16	8.89	53.33
Neither entity	10	7.52	32.26	21	11.67	67.74

Note: N = 313. EC = Employment Circumstance.

Summary of Findings

The data from the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire-Form XII and the Adult Education Administrator Personal Data Survey were analyzed. Subscale scores for all 12 dimensions of the LBDQ-XII were examined, with the significance level set at .05. Three hypotheses and 16 subhypotheses were tested in order to answer the three research questions upon which the study was based.

Discriminant function analysis was used to test the first hypothesis and its related subhypotheses. Logistic regression analysis was used to test the second and third hypotheses and related subhypotheses. Frequency

statistics were produced using the demographic variables data, and summary tables were presented.

Findings indicated that there was not a significant difference between peer-identified leaders and nonleaders among selected Florida adult education administrators as measured by their 12 dimension subscale scores on the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire-Form XII. A significant difference was found between leaders and nonleaders based on one of the four demographic variables. A significant difference was found between leaders and nonleaders based on two of the five employment circumstances: specifically, employment in a school district or a community college with shared responsibility for adult education programs.

It was noted that the F values calculated for the data from the LBDQ-XII's second dimension, Demand Reconciliation, clustered in three distinct valuations, with one value being markedly higher than the others and its Pr>F value notably close (but not statistically significantly close) to the .05 significance level established prior to data analysis. It was deemed appropriate to conduct additional analysis using that dimension subscale score to test the third hypothesis. In so doing, a significant difference was found between leaders and nonleaders with respect to the leader behavior of Demand Reconciliation when taking into account their employment circumstance. Thus, the third hypothesis was rejected.

A review of the descriptive statistics yielded information useful in an analysis of the characteristics of the adult education administrators included in the study. Over two-thirds of the respondents worked in a school district, with the largest number working in a district with sole responsibility for adult education programs. The most frequently reported highest degree held was the Master's degree. Among the females, the most frequently reported educational attainment level was the Master's degree; the same was true of the males. A greater percentage of the females had a doctorate than did the males. There was a near 50-50 split of leaders and nonleaders among the respondents. There was not a significant difference in number of males and females who responded. The largest subgroup in terms of age range was composed of those respondents between the age of 40 and 49; the mean age of the sample population was 48.75. There was a corresponding increase in age with each higher level of education.

In Chapter 5, the discussion, conclusions, and recommendations concerning the findings reported in Chapters 3 and 4 will be presented along with a discussion of the characteristics of adult education leaders and administrators in Florida.

CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Discussion

This study was designed to answer four questions concerning the leader behavior of selected adult education administrators in Florida based on the 12 dimensions of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire-Form XII and the Adult Education Administrator Personal Data Survey. Specifically, the questions that served as the basis for the study were as follows:

1(a). Is there a difference between peer-identified leaders and nonleaders in the weighted linear combination of the 12 dimension scores of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire-Form XII (LBDQ-XII)?

1(b). Which of the 12 dimension scores on the LBDQ-XII discriminate between peer-identified leaders and nonleaders?

2. Is there a difference between the leaders and nonleaders in the weighted linear combination of four selected demographic variables?

3. Is there a difference between the leaders and nonleaders in the weighted linear combination of selected LBDQ-XII dimension scores and selected demographic variables (with the dimension score selections to be based on the answers to questions 1 [a] and 1 [b])?

The LBDQ-XII, developed by Ralph Stogdill (1963), was the instrument used to secure data for use in testing the hypotheses and subhypotheses constructed for the purpose of answering the three research questions. The Adult Education Administrator Personal Data Survey, developed by the investigator, was the instrument used to gather demographic information about the respondents' age, gender, educational attainment level, and employment circumstance. Tests were conducted to determine if the two groups differed on the basis of these demographic data. These demographic data were also analyzed in correlation with the data from the LBDQ-XII response scores in an effort to ascertain if differences between the leaders and nonleaders existed on any of the behavior dimensions when controlling for the demographic variables. The descriptive personal data collected also provided information useful in analyzing the characteristics of adult education peer-identified leaders and administrators employed in Florida at the time this research was conducted.

The study included 313 respondents who were adult education administrators in Florida, 154 of whom were peer-identified leaders and 159 of whom were not identified by their peers as leaders. All 313 participants responded to the LBDQ-XII from the frame of reference of what they know from experience to be the realities of the job of adult education program administrator. All of the participants also responded to the four items on the Adult Education Administrator Personal Data Survey. As indicated in

Table 4-1, the usable response rate was 55.89%, with a leader response rate of 58.11% and a nonleader response rate of 53.90%. The gender representation of the respondents was relatively evenly divided, with 42.49% females and 57.51% males.

LBDQ-XII Composite Scores

The hypothesis that there is no significant difference in the leader behavior of peer-identified leaders and nonleaders among selected Florida adult education administrators as measured by their scores on the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire-Form XII was not rejected. This finding was not surprising, given the demographics of the respondents. What was surprising were the similarities between the two groups. There was a nearly equal number of usable responses in each of the two groups: 154 for the leaders and 159 for the nonleaders (see Table 4-1). The average age of the leaders was 49.13 years and 48.38 for the nonleaders, as shown in Table 4-6. In terms of the gender split, statistics listed in Table 4-8 indicated that among the 133 females in the study, 68 were leaders and 65 were nonleaders. Among the 180 males in the sample population, 86 were leaders and 94 were nonleaders. The gender percentages were 51.13% leaders and 48.87% nonleaders for the women and 47.78% leaders and 52.22% nonleaders for the men. Even though the proportions are essentially reversed, there is nonetheless a notably even division of the two respondent groups. It is reasonable to deduce that the similarities between

the two groups in the sample attributed to the similarity of their responses on the LBDQ-XII. Perhaps the uniqueness of this particular educational area of specialization causes adult education administrators to share a common perspective which may have contributed to the similarity of the responses. Griffith (1969) discussed at length the special skills needed by adult education administrators because they work with adult students who are beyond compulsory school age. Jarvie, Black, and Brahce (1964) also discussed the uniqueness of the tasks and needed skills of the adult education administrator. One possible explanation for the marked similarities between the leaders and nonleaders is the possibility that the unique nature of the job of adult education administrator necessitates a uniform behavior style that is consistent across the profession, whether or not an administrator is considered a leader.

Dimension Subscale Scores

Twelve subhypotheses were formulated to correspond with the 12 dimensions (subscales) of the LBDQ-XII. None of the 12 subhypotheses was rejected. As can be seen in Table 4-2, the mean subscale scores and standard deviation values of the leader and nonleader groups were notably similar. Table 4-2 lists the F values and Pr>F values for each subscale; no Pr>F value was less than .05. Because the statistical analysis results shown in Tables 4-2, 4-3, and 4-4 led to the finding that no differences existed between leaders and nonleaders on any of the 12 dimensions of the

LBDQ-XII, the third hypothesis could not be tested. That hypothesis predicted no difference between leaders and nonleaders among selected Florida adult education administrators in the weighted linear combination of the demographic variables of age, gender, educational attainment level, and employment circumstance (employed by a community college with sole responsibility for adult education, employed by a school district with sole responsibility for adult education, employed by a community college with shared responsibility for adult education, employed by a school district with shared responsibility for adult education, or neither) and whichever of the dimension subscale scores found to be significantly different after testing the first hypothesis. If statistically significant differences had been found in testing the first hypothesis, then the third hypothesis would have been tested using the results of the first hypothesis--that is, the scores for the dimension(s) for which significant difference had been determined.

As was noted in Chapter 4, scrutiny of the statistical findings of the test of the first hypothesis resulted in the recognition of a distinct grouping of the F values and probability values (see Table 4-2). The particular statistics associated with the second dimension, Demand Reconciliation, with an F value of 3.3028, was markedly higher than the others, and its Pr>F value (0.0701) was relatively much closer than the others to the .05 significance limit set prior to data analysis. Because of this distinctive value pattern, it was deemed a responsible and appropriate investigative step to

conduct further analysis. In the additional analysis, the Demand Reconciliation dimension subscale scores were judged to be sufficiently different when comparing the peer-identified leaders and nonleaders to justify being used to test the third hypothesis.

As a dimension of leader behavior, Demand Reconciliation is defined as the degree to which one reconciles conflicting demands and reduces disorder to the system (Stogdill, 1970). The statements on the LBDQ-XII that test for the Demand Reconciliation dimension focus on the ability to handle complex problems, to make order of chaos, to satisfy multiple demands, and to effectively and efficiently attend to details. A notable degree of difference in the scores of the leaders and nonleaders on this leader behavior dimension was not unusual in light of Griffith's (1969) observation that adult education administrators' responsibilities are very similar to those of school superintendent's, including the responsibility of being active community change agents. If an adult education administrator's job is as complex at that of the chief executive officer of a school system and is further complicated by additional tasks unique to the adult education enterprise, the Demand Reconciliation is a most appropriate behavior area in which a discriminating difference might be identified between leaders and nonleaders. The tasks associated with this dimension relate to every aspect of administration of adult education programs. Simerly (1990) said that because educational organizations are receiving

pressure to provide more services at lower costs which are delivered at a faster pace, they are constantly in turmoil, ambiguity, conflict, and change. He said that it is important for leaders to recognize that as ambiguity increases, conflict increases also. Simerly said that leaders are constantly negotiators. Guglielmino, Frock, and Burrichter (1988) found through interviews with adult education administrators that planning procedures, time management, flexibility, scheduling, and conflict resolution are key skills that adult education administrators need in order to successfully lead programs. These same skills are associated with Demand Reconciliation.

In her book on leadership styles, Lewis (1993) cited a report on leadership which listed the roles of analyst and planner as two of the leadership skills needed to create good schools. Gilley (as cited in Crew & Easton, 1990) found that adult educators across the nation are most interested in training in (a) communication skills as they relate to collaborative decision making and (b) forging partnerships and agreements among all organization and agencies that are serving the same population. The data in the study reported here suggested that the capacity to effectively prioritize and accomplish myriad job tasks was associated with leadership.

Demographics

The hypothesis that no significant difference between peer-identified leaders and nonleaders among selected Florida adult education

administrators based on the demographic variables of age, gender, education attainment level, and employment circumstance (employed by a community college with sole responsibility for adult education, employed by a school district with sole responsibility for adult education, employed by a community college with shared responsibility for adult education, employed by a school district with shared responsibility for adult education, or neither) was rejected. Two differences, found in the employment circumstance variable, have been included in the following discussion, which addresses each demographic variable separately.

Age. The subhypothesis that there is no significant difference between peer-identified leaders and nonleaders among selected Florida adult education administrators based on age was not rejected. As can be seen in Table 4-7, the Wald Chi-Square value for age was 0.1318 and the Pr>F value was 0.7166, indicating no significance in the difference in age between the two groups. There appears to be a great deal of homogeneity among the respondents; the mean age of the 313 respondents was 48.38, and the age means for the two groups were 49.13 for the leaders and 48.38 for the nonleaders (see Table 4-6). The absence of a significant difference based on age is in contrast to Neat's (1990/1991) study of 69 adult education administrators in Indiana in which she found a relationship between age and respondents' scores on the LBDQ-XII dimensions Initiation of Structure and Consideration of Others. The contrast is especially

noteworthy because the age data on her subjects are similar to those of the subjects of this study. On the other hand, Stefurak (1977/1978) found in his study of community education coordinators that age was not a factor in their perceived leader behavior. The divergent findings in various cited studies of leader behavior, as well as those in this study, suggest that nothing definitive can be said about the impact of age on leader behavior.

Gender. The subhypothesis that there is no significant difference between peer-identified leaders and nonleaders among selected Florida adult education administrators based on gender was not rejected based on the Wald Chi-Square value of 0.8547 and the Pr>F value of 0.3552. This finding is consistent with those of Jones (1981/1982), who studied the leader behavior of male and female Jamaican teachers' college administrators; Keener (1976/1977), who studied the perceptions of leader behavior held by male and female administrators at the University of Florida; and Stefurak (1977/1978), who studied the leader behavior of Florida community education coordinators. Rose (1991) reported that research results are mixed with regard to the expectation that women entering the administrative arena would bring a new style of leadership. She reported that overall, no clear differences have emerged. As has been previously noted, there was a marked balance in the descriptive statistics pertaining to the gender of the respondents. In terms of the responding population, 42.49% were female and 57.51% of them were male. In the leader group,

44.16% of the respondents were female and 55.84% were male (see Table 4-1). Among the nonleaders responding, 40.88% were female, while 59.12% were male. The apparent general balance in gender representation seems to suggest a certain amount of equity in professional opportunities in adult education relative to that demographic category. If that is so, perhaps at least one of the reasons for it, particularly if it is a departure from the situation in more mainstream educational programs, may be the fact that it is a secondary mission area and, as such, might be one of the few education areas which offer good opportunities for upward mobility for women. Payeur (1993) expressed the conviction that adult education can offer "a very interesting territory for women's leadership and the most promising area for developing a new leadership" (p. 14). When comparing gender statistics in terms of employment circumstance, some disparities are worthy of comment. Nearly twice as many males as females were employed as adult education administrators in school districts, but in community colleges, the statistics were reversed. This disparity may be a result of the relative newness and dynamic growth of the community colleges system, which is touted as having a more open administrative structure and fewer administrative strata than other educational systems. If these claims are accurate, such an environment may facilitate upward mobility for women. The literature seems to support this idea. Shearon and Tollefson (1989) stated that community colleges mirror their local communities and society.

One example they cited was the increase of women in the workforce. Certainly, female leaders and administrators are among them.

It should be pointed out that the findings of this study are in contrast to those of the research done by Mulkerne (1980) in which she compared the leader behavior of male and female special education directors in Florida. She found male administrators scored higher than female administrators on the LBDQ-XII and in terms of all the demographic variables used in her study. Neat (1990/1991), in her study of the leader behavior of Indiana's adult education administrators on the LBDQ-XII dimensions Consideration of Others and Initiation of Structure, found significant difference in the respondents' scores based on their gender. Stefurak (1977/1978) did not find that gender was a factor in the differences in leader behavior among Florida community education coordinators, as was the case with the administrators studied in the research reported here.

Educational attainment level. The subhypothesis that there is no significant difference between peer-identified leaders and nonleaders among selected Florida adult education administrators based on educational attainment level was not rejected. The finding of no significant difference between the two groups based on educational attainment level disputes the finding in the study of leader behavior of adult education administrators in Indiana conducted by Neat (1990/1991) in which the administrators' education attainment level affected the Initiation of Structure scores on the

LBDQ-XII. In her study, the leader behavior scores were the result of teachers' ratings of administrators as opposed to the means of data collection in the study reported herein, in which the administrators responded to the LBDQ-XII in terms of what they considered to be the realities of the job based on their own experiences.

The phenomenon of homogeneity seems to apply to the education variable as it has to other variables tested in this study, but to a somewhat lesser degree. As shown in Table 4-9, two-thirds of the respondents reported that the highest degree held was a Master's. Of the 209 people in this category, 109 of them were leaders and 100 were nonleaders. Over two-thirds of the males and females in the sample reported the Master's degree as their highest level of education. A similarly equal distribution was evident among those who reported the highest held degree to be the Specialist in Education: Nine were leaders and 10 were nonleaders. According to the findings shown in Table 4-10, there was a near even gender distribution among those whose highest level of education was the doctorate. It is apparent that the similarities discussed here had a direct and decisive bearing on having found no statistically significant difference in the leader behavior of the two groups with regard to level of education.

Employment circumstance. The subhypothesis that there is no significant difference between peer-identified leaders and nonleaders among selected Florida adult education administrators based on employment

circumstance (employed by a community college with sole responsibility for adult education, employed by a school district with sole responsibility for adult education, employed by a community college with shared responsibility for adult education, employed by a school district with shared responsibility for adult education, or neither) was rejected. The subhypothesis tested for five different employment circumstances.

The first circumstance in which significant differences was found was employment in a school district with shared responsibility for adult education. Over two-thirds of the respondents were school district employees, 100 of whom were leaders and 114 were nonleaders (see Table 4-11). The single largest category included the leaders who worked in school districts with sole responsibility for adult education ($n = 72$), and the second largest response category was made up of nonleaders who worked in school districts with sole responsibility for adult education ($n = 63$). These findings may be explained by the fact that several of the larger urban areas in the state--Pinellas, Hillsborough, Orange, Broward, and Palm Beach Counties--are all areas in which adult education programs are operated solely by the school districts. It seems reasonable to speculate that a large number of responses came from these districts. This same speculation may also be made about the next two largest groups of respondents, who were the nonleaders and leaders from school districts with shared responsibility for adult education. Many of those respondents were most likely from counties

such as Dade, Duval, and Escambia, all of which are also relatively large population centers.

The discriminating effect on leader behavior of working in a community college which shared responsibility for adult education was also statistically significant. This reciprocal of the school district with shared responsibility is logical in view of the fact that these are the two delivery systems that would be involved in a shared arrangement. It should be noted that the significance value for the school district respondents was stronger than that of the community college group among the significantly different group scores (see Table 4-5). The finding that leadership among adult education administrators is tied to working in a community college with shared responsibility for adult education programs is consistent with current thinking on what community colleges must do to effectively accomplish their mission. A key recommendation from the National Roundtable on Economic Development (cited in Shearon & Tollefson, 1989) was that community colleges should develop collaborative partnerships and networks with other educational delivery systems. The findings in this study suggested that the collaboration present in a shared program responsibility situation was associated with the leader behavior demonstrated by the administrators.

Two other employment circumstances included in the employment circumstance demographic variable are shown here with their respective scores, which indicated no statistically significant differences between the

two groups. For those respondents whose employment was in a community college with sole responsibility for adult education, the Wald Chi-Square value was 0.5835 and the Pr>F value was 0.4449 (see Table 4-5). For the administrators whose employment was in a school district with sole responsibility for adult education, the Wald Chi-Square value was 2.7560 and the Pr>F value was 0.0969.

None of the other studies reviewed for this research addressed the issue of the governance of adult education programs as a factor of leadership. It was noteworthy that the challenges of cooperation and collaboration in the face of the competitiveness for students and the resultant Full Time Equivalent (FTE) dollars did affect the extent of leader behavior, whereas working where the employer was the sole provider of adult education programs was not a discriminating factor. Perhaps this is due to the political wisdom of cultivating an atmosphere of cooperation in order to facilitate maximum educational benefit to students, to maximize the effectiveness of limited resources, and to avoid losing any program responsibilities and thus FTE-based appropriations. Spear and Mocker (1989), when making suggestions about specific actions adult educators might take in the future to give direction to the field, included the formation of new collaborative relationships. The findings reported here suggest that this behavior has begun to be evident in Florida.

Regression Values

The hypothesis that there is no significant difference between peer-identified leaders and nonleaders among selected Florida adult education administrators in the weighted linear combination of selected LBDQ-XII dimension scores as determined in the analysis of Ho_1, controlling for the demographic variables of age, gender, educational attainment level, and employment circumstance (employed by a community college with sole responsibility for adult education, employed by a school district with sole responsibility for adult education, employed by a community college with shared responsibility for adult education, employed by a school district with shared responsibility for adult education, or neither) was rejected. It should be noted that due to the distinctive nature of the significance scores on the Demand Reconciliation subscale, it was decided to conduct additional analysis using the respondents' scores on the Demand Reconciliation dimension of the LBDQ-XII, even though they were not found to be significantly different. The F value of 3.3028 (see Table 4-2) was so distinctly different from the F value of any of the other dimensions of the LBDQ-XII that the additional analysis was determined to be a responsible research step. The Pr>F value of 0.0701 was notably close to the .05 level set prior to data analysis and served to reinforce to decision to conduct further analysis.

The results of the additional analysis indicated that differences between the leaders and nonleaders existed in terms of the leader behavior dimension Demand Reconciliation when controlling for four demographic variables. Using logistic regression analysis to test the data, it was found that those who worked in school districts and community colleges in which the responsibility for adult education programs was shared between the two educational entities tended to score higher on the Demand Reconciliation dimension of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire-Form XII (see Table 4-5). That is, the administrators who worked in circumstances where responsibility for adult education programs was shared tended to have more ability to handle complex problems, to make order of chaos, to satisfy multiple demands better, and to attend to details effectively and efficiently. They tended to score higher on the ability to reconcile conflicting demands and reduce disorder to the system. The adult education administrators who were considered to be leaders were those who stressed demonstrating greater ability to reconcile, through effective and decisive action, the multitude of demands, often conflicting, that are associated with administering adult education programs. Maxson and Sistrunk (1973) asserted that change is demanded of education, which needs more than managers who facilitate the stability of the status quo; the need is for leaders who can move organizations in a mode of continuous renewal in response to changing needs. Effective reconciliation of the demands of

administering adult education programs certainly fits into this framework. Chemers (1984), in his discussion of various leadership theories, mentioned that the Multiple Influence Model assumes that the organization's environment and structure influence the administrator's leader behavior. In the case of the study reported here, an environment in which programmatic responsibility is shared significantly influenced the leaders' behavior, specifically in terms of handling the demands of the job. Buffie (1989) pointed out that leaders need to be skillful in helping groups work collaboratively. Certainly, this skill is important in the shared responsibility environment and facilitates the reduction of conflict. Jarvie, Black, and Brahce (1964), in discussing the special leadership skills needed by adult education administrators, gave emphasis to the importance of working constantly to cooperate with outside agencies. Their position reinforces the significance of the difference reported here. Walker (1981) said that the most effective administrators work to reconcile the differences among constituencies and consider themselves to be problem solvers whose principal qualifications are wisdom and diplomacy. The present study results seem to indicate that the same is true among adult education administrators who are considered to be leaders.

Nothing was found in the literature that addressed shared responsibility for adult education programs per se, but the recurring themes of cooperation, collaboration, and organizational environment cited here

seem to reinforce the finding that the effect of work circumstance on the specific leader behavior dimension known as Demand Reconciliation was significant and important.

Adult Education Leader and Administrator Characteristics

Data were gathered from the sample population's responses to the items on the Adult Education Administrator Personal Data Survey and their scores on the LBDQ-XII. The following general description of leaders and administrators in adult education in Florida at the time this research was done was extracted from the data gleaned from the sample.

Approximately 58% of the Florida adult education administrators were male. At least 86 of them are considered by their peers to be leaders in adult education in the state. Among the adult education administrators who are considered to be leaders, 56% were male. Of those adult education administrators who were not considered by their peers to be leaders (see Table 4-8), just over 59% of them were male. The males' average age was 49.65 years, which was 2 years older than their female peers' mean age of 47.53 (see Table 4-6).

The men were well educated administrators: 97% of them held graduate degrees, with two-thirds of them having reported a Master's degree as their highest level of education. Nearly one in five of the men had completed their doctorate (see Table 4-9).

Just over 75% of the men in the sample population were employed in a school district, with twice as many men working in a district with sole responsibility for adult education programs as those working in districts which shared the program responsibility. Just under 13% of the men worked in community colleges, while nearly 12% of them worked in some other type of educational setting--for example, a university, the state department of education, or a correctional facility (see Table 4-13). Men comprised two-thirds of the adult education administrators in school districts; in contrast, they accounted for only one-third of those who worked in community colleges.

Approximately 42% of the adult education administrators in Florida were females. Their peers considered at least 68 of them to be leaders in their field in this state. Of the usable names gathered who were peer-identified leaders, 44% were women. Females accounted for just under 41% of the 159 adult education administrators who were not considered by their peers to be leaders (see Table 4-8).

The average age of the female adult educators was 47.53 years, which was about 14 months younger than the average age of the entire sample population (see Table 4-6). When compared with the men, a greater percentage of the women had earned a doctorate (20.30%), but a greater (albeit small) percentage of the women than men had only an Associate's degree or a Bachelor's degree--in fact, at four times the rate of the men (see

Table 4-10). Like their male counterparts, nearly two-thirds of the women had a Master's degree.

Women accounted for two-thirds of the adult education administrators who worked in community colleges. Nearly 82% of those who worked in community colleges with sole responsibility for adult education programs were female (see Table 4-13). The women comprised over one-third of the adult education administrators who worked in school districts.

The designation as leader was rather evenly distributed between the genders. The higher their level of education, the older they were (see Table 4-9). The administrators' average age was 48 years and 9 months, and nearly half of sample population were between the ages of 40 and 49 (see Table 4-7). Over 40% of the respondents were over 50. Those administrators with a doctorate were most likely to work in a school district or community college with sole responsibility for adult education (see Table 4-12). Younger administrators were less likely to be considered leaders. If the administrators worked in a community college or a school district which had shared responsibility for adult education programs, they tended to show greater leadership behavior when bringing order to chaos and efficiency to handling details and conflicting demands. In terms of other leadership behaviors, they held similar views of the realities of administering adult education programs.

In the analysis of the data in the research discussed here, the investigator found no single behavior dimension that readily identifies leaders in adult education in Florida. Perhaps there is very little difference in the way most Florida adult education administrators demonstrate leadership when administering such critical educational programs for adult learners--programs that require a special type of professional to lead programs effectively so that the adult students, beyond compulsory school age, will find the offerings attractive enough to make time in their busy lives to participant in and benefit from the classes.

Adult education programs would be well served by the decision makers' selection of administrators who can efficiently handle conflicting demands, effectively handle details, and bring order to chaos. Adult education administrators in Florida would benefit from staff development activities that would teach and foster all of the 12 leader behavior dimensions. These new leaders would become, as Simerly (1990, p. 20) described them, "trailblazers who seek new and innovative ways to strengthen their organizations, help people develop lifelong learning skills that assist them in leader more productive lives, and link lifelong learning into the social conscience of society."

Conclusions

In an effort to analyze the leader characteristics of adult education administrators in Florida, the leader behavior of Florida adult education

administrators was measured by surveying selected Florida adult education administrators using the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire-Form XII and the Adult Education Administrator Personal Data Survey. The LBDQ-XII's 12 dimension subscale scores were compared using discriminant function analysis in an effort to identify those leader behavior dimensions that tend to differentiate between leaders and nonleaders among the adult education administrators. The data gathered regarding the four variables of personal demographics--age, gender, educational attainment level, and employment circumstance--were subjected to logistic regression analysis in order to identify differences between leaders and nonleaders and to determine the extent to which any of the demographic variables affected the degree of leader behavior among the respondents with respect to a specific leader behavior dimension.

In general, the outcomes of the study lead to the conclusion that there are no significant differences between the leaders and nonleaders in terms of the demographic variables and the 12 dimensions of leader behavior as measured by their scores on the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire-Form XII.

Answers to the research questions posed at the outset of the study are provided based on the analysis of the collected and analyzed data.

1(a). There was no significant difference between peer-identified leaders and nonleaders in the weighted linear combination of the 12 dimension scores of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire-Form XII (LBDQ-XII).

1(b). None of the 12 dimension scores on the LBDQ-XII discriminated between peer-identified leaders and nonleaders. This finding was based on the applying the limitation of the .05 level of significance. Because the F value on the Demand Reconciliation dimension subscale (3.3028) was remarkably higher than the other 11 subscale scores and because its Pr>F value (0.0701) was notably (although not statistically significantly) close to the .05 level established prior to data analysis, the decision was made to conduct further analysis using that subscale's scores.

2. There was a significant difference between the leaders and nonleaders in the weighted linear combination of one of the four selected demographic variables. The differences between the leaders and nonleaders were found among those respondents who worked in either school districts or community colleges which have shared responsibility for adult education programs.

3. There was a significant difference between the leaders and nonleaders in the weighted linear combination of the LBDQ-XII dimension scores for Demand Reconciliation and the demographic variable of employment circumstance, specifically among respondents who were

employed in either school districts or community colleges with shared responsibility for administering adult education programs. This finding was a part of the additional analysis and was based on the use of the Demand Reconciliation dimension subscale scores.

The data collected through the administration of the Adult Education Administrator Personal Data Survey indicated a notable balance among the respondents when comparing the leaders and nonleaders in terms of age, gender, educational attainment level, and employment circumstance. A distinct picture of the typical adult education administrator employed in Florida at the time of this research emerged from the analysis of the descriptive data. Characteristics were discussed about both the males and the females who were employed as adult education administrators in Florida at the time of this research. The characteristics of the aggregate group were also discussed. The typical administrator employed as an adult administrator in Florida at the time of this study was a male who was 49.13 years of age, who held a Master's degree, and who worked in a school district which had sole responsibility for adult education programs. He showed a certain facility for bringing order to chaos to a greater degree than he did for any of the other leader behaviors studied that he might have exhibited.

The scores on the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire-Form XII shown in Table 4-3 provided some insight into what 313 Florida adult

education administrators believed about the leader behavior realities of the job of administering adult education programs as they knew it to be. The scoring was based on a forced choice rating scale, with the choices being always, often, occasionally, seldom, and never. In Appendix C, dimension subscale composition is provided along with scoring instructions. The table also includes information on the scores of the nonleaders. Given that no significant differences at the .05 were found on the dimension scores of the leaders and nonleaders used in this study, it seemed that leaders and nonleaders had very similar ideas about the realities of their jobs. Because none of the scores suggested that the extreme ratings of all fives or all ones were recorded for any of the questionnaire items, it appears that responses were not based on the ideal, but rather on the real behaviors, which was the approach requested of the respondents by the investigator.

Recommendations

The following recommendations for further research are suggested in an effort to expand the knowledge base about leadership in adult education. It is speculated that the conduct of such research will facilitate the evolution of the status of the field to parity with other educational enterprises as a fully enfranchised academic discipline and to foster its image as a viable, desirable, and prestigious career choice.

1. This study should be expanded to include administration of the LBDQ-XII for the purpose of comparing reality scores with superordinate

ratings, subordinate ratings, and self-ratings of adult education administrators. Such a study would help ascertain discrepancies between the perceived realities of the job of adult education administrators, how they think they do the job, and how their professional colleagues think they do the job.

2. A study should be conducted which investigates a large number of demographic variables of adult education administrators and how they relate to measured leader behavior. This research may yield information useful for field aspirants and for the development of inservice curricula.

3. A study should be conducted comparing the leader behavior of adult education administrators to K-12 administrators, community college administrators, and business/industry-based training administrators in an effort to determine if any leader behavior dimensions distinguish one population from the other and if any are unique to adult education administrators.

4. Research should be conducted which compares in great detail adult education administrators in school districts, community colleges, and other educational entities in an effort to learn more about which professional environment seems to facilitate the development of solid leader behavior and identification as a leader.

APPENDIX A
ADULT EDUCATION ADMINISTRATOR PERSONAL DATA SURVEY

Please supply responses as indicated below.

1. **I am**
   ___ male
   ___ female

2. **My age is**
   ____

3. **The highest degree I hold is**
   ___ AA/AS ___ MA/MS ___ EdS
   ___ BA/BS ___ EdD/PhD ___ Other professional degree (J.D., M.D., D.D.S.)

4. **I am employed by a(n)**
   ___ school district with sole responsibility for adult education programs
   ___ school district which shares with other educational entities responsibility for adult education programs
   ___ community college with sole responsibility for adult education programs
   ___ community college which shares with other educational entities responsibility for adult education programs
   ___ entity that is neither school district nor community college

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND ASSISTANCE

APPENDIX B
LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE-FORM XII

DIRECTIONS

A. READ each item carefully.

B. THINK about how frequently the leader engages in the behavior described by the item.

C. DECIDE whether he/she (A) always, (B) often, (C) occasionally, (D) seldom, or (E) never should act as described by the item.

D. DRAW A CIRCLE around one of the five letters (A B C D E) following the statement to show the answer you have selected.

A = Always
B = Often
C = Occasionally
D = Seldom
E = Never

---

1. Acts as the spokesperson of the group . . . . . A B C D E

2. Waits patiently for the results of a decision . . . . . A B C D E

3. Makes pep talks to stimulate the group . . . . . A B C D E

4. Lets group members know what is expected of them . . . . . A B C D E

5. Allows the members complete freedom in their work . . . . . A B C D E

6. Is hesitant about taking initiative in the group . . . A B C D E

7. Is friendly and approachable . . . . . A B C D E

A = Always
B = Often
C = Occasionally
D = Seldom
E = Never

8. Encourages overtime work . . . . . A B C D E

9. Makes accurate decisions . . . . . A B C D E

10. Gets along well with the people above him/her . A B C D E

11. Publicizes the activities of the group . . . . . A B C D E

12. Becomes anxious when he/she cannot find out what is coming next . . . . . A B C D E

13. His/her arguments are convincing . . . . . A B C D E

14. Encourages the use of uniform procedures . . . . A B C D E

15. Permits the members to use their own judgment in solving problems . . . . . A B C D E

16. Fails to take necessary action . . . . . A B C D E

17. Does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group . . . . . A B C D E

18. Stresses being ahead of competing groups . . . . A B C D E

19. Keeps the group working together as a team . . . A B C D E

20. Keeps the group in good standing with higher authority . . . . . A B C D E

21. Speaks as the representative of the group . . . . . A B C D E

22. Accepts defeat in stride . . . . . A B C D E

23. Argues persuasively for his/her point of view . . . A B C D E

A = Always
B = Often
C = Occasionally
D = Seldom
E = Never

24. Tries out his/her ideas in the group . . . . . A B C D E

25. Encourages initiative in the group members . . . . A B C D E

26. Lets other persons take away his/her leadership in the group . . . . . A B C D E

27. Puts suggestions made by the group into operation . . . . . A B C D E

28. Needles members for greater effort . . . . . A B C D E

29. Seems able to predict what is coming next . . . . A B C D E

30. Is working hard for a promotion . . . . . A B C D E

31. Speaks for the group when visitors are present . . . . . A B C D E

32. Accepts delays without becoming upset . . . . . A B C D E

33. Is a very persuasive talker . . . . . A B C D E

34. Makes his/her attitudes clear to the group . . . . . A B C D E

35. Lets the members do their work the way they think best . . . . . A B C D E

36. Lets some members take advantage of him/her . . . . . A B C D E

37. Treats all group members as his/her equals . . . . A B C D E

38. Keeps the work moving at a rapid pace . . . . . A B C D E

39. Settles conflicts when they occur in the group . . A B C D E

A = Always
B = Often
C = Occasionally
D = Seldom
E = Never

40. His/her superiors act favorably on most of his/her suggestions . . . . . A B C D E

41. Represents the group at outside meetings . . . . . A B C D E

42. Becomes anxious when waiting for new development . . . . . A B C D E

43. Is very skillful in an argument . . . . . A B C D E

44. Decides what shall be done and how it shall be done . . . . . A B C D E

45. Assigns a task, then lets the member handle it . . . . . A B C D E

46. Is the leader of the group in name only . . . . . A B C D E

47. Gives advance notice of changes . . . . . A B C D E

48. Pushes for increased production . . . . . A B C D E

49. Things usually turn out as he/she predicts . . . . . A B C D E

50. Enjoys the privileges of his/her position . . . . . A B C D E

51. Handles complex problems efficiently . . . . . A B C D E

52. Is able to tolerate postponement and uncertainty . . . . . A B C D E

53. Is not a very convincing talker . . . . . A B C D E

54. Assigns group members to particular tasks . . . . A B C D E

55. Turns the members loose on a job and lets them go to it . . . . . A B C D E

A = Always
B = Often
C = Occasionally
D = Seldom
E = Never

56. Backs down when he/she ought to stand firm . . A B C D E

57. Keeps to himself/herself . . . . . A B C D E

58. Asks the members to work harder . . . . . A B C D E

59. Is accurate in predicting the trend of events . . . A B C D E

60. Gets his/her superiors to act for the welfare of the group members . . . . . A B C D E

61. Gets swamped by details . . . . . A B C D E

62. Can wait just so long, then blows up . . . . . A B C D E

63. Speaks from a strong inner conviction . . . . . A B C D E

64. Makes sure that his/her part in the group is understood by the group members . . . . . A B C D E

65. Is reluctant to allow the members any freedom of action . . . . . A B C D E

66. Lets some members have authority that he/she should keep . . . . . A B C D E

67. Looks out for the personal welfare of the group members . . . . . A B C D E

68. Permits the members to take it easy in their work . . . . . A B C D E

69. Sees to it that the work of the group is coordinated . . . . . A B C D E

A = Always
B = Often
C = Occasionally
D = Seldom
E = Never

70. His/her work carries weight with superiors . . . . . A B C D E

71. Gets things all tangled up . . . . . A B C D E

72. Remains calm when uncertain about coming events . . . . . A B C D E

73. Is an inspiring talker . . . . . A B C D E

74. Schedules the work to be done . . . . . A B C D E

75. Allows the group a high degree of initiative . . . . . A B C D E

76. Takes full charge when emergencies arise . . . . . A B C D E

77. Is willing to make changes . . . . . A B C D E

78. Drives hard when there is a job to be done . . . . A B C D E

79. Helps group members settle their differences . . . A B C D E

80. Gets what he/she asks for from his/her superiors . . . . . A B C D E

81. Can reduce a madhouse to system and order . . . A B C D E

82. Is able to delay action until the proper time occurs . . . . . A B C D E

83. Persuades others that his/her ideas are to their advantage . . . . . A B C D E

84. Maintains definite standards of performance . . . A B C D E

A = Always
B = Often
C = Occasionally
D = Seldom
E = Never

85. Trusts the members to exercise good judgment . A B C D E

86. Overcomes attempts made to challenge his/her leadership . . . . . A B C D E

87. Refuses to explain his/her actions . . . . . A B C D E

88. Urges the group to beat its previous record . . . . A B C D E

89. Anticipates problems and plans for them . . . . . A B C D E

90. Is working his/her way to the top . . . . . A B C D E

91. Gets confused when too many demands are made of him/her . . . . . A B C D E

92. Worries about the outcome of a new procedure . A B C D E

93. Can inspire enthusiasm for a project . . . . . A B C D E

94. Asks that group members follow standard rules and regulations . . . . . A B C D E

95. Permits the group to set its own pace . . . . . A B C D E

96. Is easily recognized as the leader of the group . . A B C D E

97. Acts without consulting the group . . . . . A B C D E

98. Keeps the group working up to capacity . . . . . A B C D E

99. Maintains a closely knit group . . . . . A B C D E

100. Maintains cordial relations with superiors . . . . . A B C D E

APPENDIX C
LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE-FORM XII
DIMENSION SUBSCALE ITEMS

1.	Representation	1, 11, 21, 31, 41
2.	Reconciliation	51, 61, 71, 81, 91
3.	Tolerance of Uncertainty	2, 12, 22, 32, 42, 52, 62, 72, 82, 92
4.	Persuasion	3, 13, 23, 33, 43, 53, 63, 73, 83, 93
5.	Initiation of Structure	4, 14, 24, 34, 44, 54, 64, 74, 84, 94
6.	Tolerance of Freedom	5, 15, 25, 35, 45, 55, 65, 75, 85, 95
7.	Role Assumption	6, 16, 26, 36, 46, 56, 66, 76, 86, 96
8.	Consideration of Others	7, 17, 27, 37, 47, 57, 67, 77, 87, 97
9.	Production Emphasis	8, 18, 28, 38, 48, 58, 68, 78, 88, 98
10.	Predictive Accuracy	9, 29, 49, 59, 89
11.	Integration	19, 39, 69, 79, 99
12.	Superior Orientation	10, 20, 30, 40, 50, 60, 70, 80, 90, 100

Note: Responses to item numbers with and "*" below them are to be scored 1, 2, 3, 4, 5; all others are to be scored 5, 4, 3, 2, 1.

APPENDIX D
LETTER REQUESTING LIST OF NAMES FOR REPUTATIONAL TECHNIQUE

Dear

I am conducting research on the leader behaviors of adult education administrators in Florida. One part of the study will involve asking all adult education administrators in the state to name ten leaders in adult education in Florida. In order for me to glean the names of the research subjects, I need the names and mailing addresses of all adult education administrators in your district.

I would greatly appreciate your taking a few minutes to provide this information. If there is anything I can do to facilitate your providing this information, please call me at 904-254-3077 or SunCom 372-3077. You may FAX your list to me at 904-254-3063.

I thank you in advance for your kind assistance.

Sincerely,

Beverly McMurtry Grissom

APPENDIX E
FOLLOW-UP REMINDER POSTCARD REQUESTING NAMES FOR REPUTATIONAL TECHNIQUE

Hi!

Three weeks ago I sent you a letter requesting the names of all adult education administrators in your district so that I may conduct research on the leader behaviors of adult education administrators.

If you have sent that information, please accept my gratitude. If you haven't yet sent the names and addresses, PLEASE take a few minutes and do so today!

You may FAX your list to me at 904-254-3063 or call the information in to me at 904-254-3077 or SunCom 372-3077.

I thank you for your help in this project.

Sincerely,

Bev Grissom

APPENDIX F
LETTER REQUESTING ADMINISTRATORS' LEADER LISTS

Dear Colleague:

I am conducting research regarding the leader behavior of adult education administrators. Your assistance will provide very valuable information for this effort. The information you can provide will serve as a crucial component of the research design. It is hoped that the results of this study will benefit the field of adult education by providing information you can use when selecting administrators for your staff or when making decisions regarding professional development opportunities.

Please list in random order on the enclosed form the names of ten Florida adult education administrators whom you consider to be leaders in adult education in this state. Please be assured that your response will be anonymous to me and confidential. The responses will be tallied by a colleague who is not an adult educator and who is unfamiliar with you or those whose names you submit. I will receive only the tallied lists. The response forms will not be viewed by me. This added measure to ensure your anonymity is included due to my being an adult education administrator in Florida. My name will not be included in the study in any way other than author.

If you would like a copy of the findings of the research, please supply your name and address on the bottom of this letter and return it with your leader list.

Please mail your response to me as soon as possible in the postage paid addressed envelope.

I extend to you my sincere appreciation for your cooperation, assistance, and promptness.

Sincerely,

Beverly McMurtry Grissom

APPENDIX G
FOLLOW-UP POSTCARD FOR LEADER LISTS

Three weeks ago, you received a request from me for the names of 10 people whom you consider to be leaders in adult education in Florida. If you have already sent your list, please accept my thanks. If you have not, please do so as soon as possible. The address to which you may send them is Adult and Lifelong Learning Office, Daytona Beach Community College, P.O. Box 2811, Daytona Beach, Florida, 32120-2811. For your convenience, you may fax them to 904-254-3063 or you may telephone Ms. McGreevy at 254-3000, extension 3320 and provide her the names. Your call will be kept confidential.

Thank you for your assistance.

Beverly McMurtry Grissom

APPENDIX H
SECOND FOLLOW-UP POSTCARD FOR LEADER LISTS

Call for assistance!

Have you sent your list of 10 people whom you consider to be leaders in adult education in Florida?

If so, I thank you!

If not, I need your help in securing an adequate response rate in order to continue my research.

Please fax your list to 904-254-3063 or call 904-254-3000 ext. 3320 and provide the list to Ms. McGreevy.

Thank you for your help.

Bev Grissom

APPENDIX I
LETTER TO PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS

Dear Colleague:

I am conducting research on the leader behavior of adult education administrators. It is hoped that the results of this investigation will enhance the field of adult education by providing an adult education leader profile that may be useful to you. The purpose of this letter is to seek your assistance in this research effort by your responding to a very brief demographic questionnaire and to the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire-Form XII (LBDQ-XII), both of which are enclosed.

Please note: When responding to the LBDQ-XII, please respond in terms of what you know to be the REALITY of administering adult education programs. The questionnaire is NOT to be answered as if were a self-assessment, nor should your responses be based on what you consider to be the ideal way to behave. The reality of the job should be your frame of reference.

The two brief questionnaires should take no more than 15 minutes to complete. Please complete them and return them in the provided postage-paid return envelope within two weeks. Certainly, even faster turn-around would be most appreciated.

Your anonymity is assured. Your name and address are on the return envelope for use only in the event that you indicate interest in research results by checking the box on the BACK of the postage-paid return envelope. The handwritten coding number you see on your questionnaires is there only to avoid sending you reminders to return your questionnaires once you have done so. A colleague who is unfamiliar with you will receive all responses. I will receive from her only the aggregate responses. I have excluded my own name form the population and sample of this study; my only role is investigator.

If you have any questions regarding the study, please don't hesitate to contact me. Please accept my sincere thanks for your assistance in conducting this research.

Sincerely,

Beverly McMurtry Grissom

APPENDIX J
FOLLOW-UP POSTCARD TO LEADERS AND NONLEADERS

Two weeks ago you received questionnaires concerning leader behavior of adult education administrators in Florida.

If you have already completed and returned the questionnaires, please accept my sincere thanks. If not, please do so today. It is very important to to the accuracy of the study to include your responses.

Thank you.

Bev Grissom

APPENDIX K
SECOND FOLLOW-UP POST CARD TO LEADERS AND NONLEADERS

Hi!

Four weeks ago you received from me 2 questionnaires concerning leader behavior of adult education administrators in Florida.

According to our records, we have not yet received your responses. I can't tell you how much I need your completed questionnaires. Without them, I may not have enough responses to complete the research.

Please send them back today!

To save us both time, you may even FAX your completed forms to my assistant at 904-254-3063.

Please help me with this research! Return your completed questionnaires today!

Questions? Call Gertrud at 904-255-8131, Ext. 3320

Thanks!

Bev Grissom

APPENDIX L
LETTER REQUESTING PERMISSION TO USE THE LBDQ-XII

April 22, 1993

John Mills
Director
Administration and Budget
College of Business
The Ohio State University
1775 College Road
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Dear Mr. Mills:

I am a doctoral student in Educational Leadership in the College of Education at the University of Florida. My major professor is Dr. James Hensel. I am proposing to conduct research on the leader behavior of adult education administrators in Florida and want to use the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire-Form XII as the primary data gathering instrument.

By copy of this correspondence, I am requesting permission to use the LBDQ-XII in my research. I plan to conduct my research in the next few months and hope to receive a positive response to my request at your earliest convenience.

Any supplemental information you can provide me regarding the instrument, including reliability and validity, will be greatly appreciated. Should you require further information from me, I will gladly supply it.

Sincerely,

Beverly McMurtry Grissom

APPENDIX M
PERMISSION LETTER TO USE THE LBDQ-XII

T · H · E
OHIO
STATE
UNIVERSITY

Business Research

College of Business
1775 College Road
Columbus, OH 43210-1399

Phone 614-292-5031
FAX 614-292-1651

April 23, 1993

Ms. Beverly McMurtry Grissom
70 Timberlake Lane
Ormond Beach, Florida 32174

Dear Ms. Grissom:

We grant you permission to use the **Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire-Form XII** for your doctoral study at the University of Florida. Please follow the guidelines on the attached Statement of Policy.

In response to your request, I have enclosed information regarding the reliability and validity of the **Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire-Form XII**. Please use the enclosed Order Form when placing your order.

Sincerely yours,

John M. Mills, Director
Administration and Budget

REFERENCES

American heritage dictionary. (1985). New York: Dell.

Bass, B. M. (1981). Stogdill's handbook of leadership. New York: The Free Press.

Bass, B. M. (1990). Bass and Stogdill's handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications. New York: The Free Press.

Blake, R. R., & Mouton, J. S. (1964). The managerial grid. Houston: Gulf.

Blumer, H. (1969). Symbolic interactionism: Perspective and method. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Boles, H. W., & Davenport, J. A. (1983). Introduction to educational leadership. New York: University Press of America.

Buffie, E. G. (1989). The principal and leadership. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.

Burns, J. M., (1978). Leadership. New York: Harper & Row.

Carpenter, D. A. (1969). The application of discriminant function analysis to social science survey research data: The attempt to recover "non-identified" communists from the Italian data of *The Civic Culture*. Unpublished master's thesis. University of Florida, Gainesville, FL.

Chemers, M. M. (1984). The social, organizational, and cultural context of effective leadership. In B. Kellerman (Ed.), Leadership: Multi-disciplinary perspectives (pp. 91-112). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Courtney, S. (1989). Defining adult and continuing education. In S. B. Merriam & Cunningham, P. M. (Eds.), Handbook of adult and continuing education (pp. 15-25). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Crew, E., & Easton, P. (1990). Adult literacy leadership project: Volume II. Tallahassee: Florida State University, Center for Policy Studies in Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 330 793)

Darkenwald, G. G., & Merriam, S. B. (1982). Adult education: Foundations of practice. New York: Harper & Row.

Dipboye, R. L. (1978). Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, Form 12. In O. Buros (Ed.), The eighth mental measurements yearbook (Vol. II, pp. 1747-1751). Highland Park, NJ: The Gryphon Press.

Fischer, C. F. (Ed.). (1978). Developing and evaluating administrative leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Florida School Laws (1990 Edition). (1990). Tallahassee, FL: Florida Department of Education.

Gamson, W. A. (1966). Reputation and resources in community politics. American Journal of Sociology, 72(2), 121-131.

Giammatteo, M., & Giammatteo, D. (1981). Forces on leadership. Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.

Gilbert, E. H. (1976). A superintendent's perception of an adult education director. Thresholds in Secondary Education, 2(1), 25, 29.

Griffith, W. S. (1969). The evolving role of the adult education director. In N. C. Shaw (Ed.), Administration of continuing education (pp. 76-101). Washington, DC: National Association for Public Continuing and Adult Education.

Guglielmino, L., Frock, T., & Burrichter, A. (1988). The adult community education administrator position: A job analysis. Ft. Lauderdale: Florida Atlantic University.

Harris, W. M. (1980). The community college academic dean's leadership behavior as perceived by superordinates and faculty in selected colleges Florida (Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1979). Dissertation Abstracts International, 40, 4431A.

Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1977). Management of organizational behavior. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Hunter, F. (1953). Community power structure. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.

Jarvie, L. L., Black, M. F., & Brahce, C. I. (1964). Adult education to meet today's needs. In Prentice-Hall Editorial Staff (Eds.), School executive's guide (pp. 265-294). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Jennings, M. K. (1964). Community influentials: The elites of Atlanta. London: Collier-Macmillan.

Jones, S. O. (1982). Perceptions of the leadership behavior of male and female administrators of Jamaican teachers' colleges: An analysis (Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1981). Dissertation Abstracts International, 42, 3882A.

Keener, B. J. (1977). An analysis of the perceptions of the leadership behavior of male and female University of Florida administrators (Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1976). Dissertation Abstracts International, 37, 4023A.

Kellerman, B. (Ed.). (1984). Leadership: Multi-disciplinary perspectives. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Kimbrough, R. B., & Nunnery, M. Y. (1974). Educational administration: An introduction. New York: Macmillan.

Kimbrough, R. B., & Nunnery, M. Y. (1988). Educational administration: An introduction. New York: Macmillan.

Kirk, J., & Miller, M. (1986). Reliability and validity in qualitative research. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Klecka, W. R. (1980). Discriminant analysis. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Kleinbaum, D. G., & Kupper, L. L. (1978). Applied regression analysis and other multivariable methods. North Scituate, MA: Duxbury Press.

Lewis, A. (1993). Leadership styles. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.

Mason, R. C. (1991, November). Positive visionary leadership: An organization's most successful component. Adult Learning, pp. 7, 13.

Maxson, R. C., & Sistrunk, W. E. (1973). A systems approach to educational administration. Dubuque, IA: William C. Brown.

Mazlish, B. (1984). History, philosophy, and leadership. In B. Kellerman (Ed.), Leadership: Multi-disciplinary perspectives (pp. 1-22). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

McGregor, D. (1966). Leadership and motivation. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Mitchell, D. E., & Tucker, S. (1992, February). Leadership as a way of thinking. Educational Leadership, pp. 30-35.

Mitchell, J. G. (1990). Re-visioning educational leadership. New York: Garland.

Mulkerne, S. (1980). A comparative study of perceived leadership behavior in male and female exceptional student education directors in the state of Florida (Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1980). Dissertation Abstracts International, 41, 3988A.

Murphy, P. J. (1989). Selecting school leaders: Tradition must be challenged. The Clearing House, 63, 101-106.

Neat, S. F. (1991) A study of the relationships between initiating structure and consideration behaviors and selected demographic variables of adult education administrators in Indiana (Doctoral dissertation, Ball State University, 1990). Dissertation Abstracts International, 51, 3305A.

Neter, J., Wasserman, W., & Kutner, M. H. (1985). Applied linear statistical models. Homewood, IL: Irwin.

Nunnery, M. Y., & Kimbrough, R. B. (1971). Politics, power, polls, and school elections. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Paisey, A. (1984). Trends in educational leadership thought. In P. Harling (Ed.), New directions in educational leadership (pp. 23-37). Philadelphia: Falmer Press.

Patton, M. Q. (1990). Qualitative evaluation and research methods. Newbury Park, NJ: Sage.

Payeur, G. (1993, May/June). Women as adult educators: Contributions to a new leadership. Adult Learning, pp. 12, 14, 24.

Polsby, N. W. (1980). Community power and political theory. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Press, S. J., & Wilson, S. (1978). Choosing between logistic regression and discriminant analysis. Journal of the American Statistical Association. 73, 699-705.

Rose, A. (1991, November). The vacuum in adult education: Who will lead? Adult Learning, p. 6.

Rosenthal, T. (1977). Job satisfaction and leader behavior of adult education administrators. Dissertation Abstracts International, 38, 73A. (University Microfilms No. 77-13,624)

Shearon, R. W., & Tollefson, T. A. (1989). Community colleges. In S. B. Merriam & P. M. Cunningham (Eds.), Handbook of adult and continuing education (pp. 316-331). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Simerly, R. G. (1990, January). Stratonomics: Developing new leadership skills. Adult Learning, pp. 19-22.

Smith, D. H., & Offerman, M. J. (1989). The management of adult and continuing education. In S. B. Merriam & P. M. Cunningham (Eds.), Handbook of adult and continuing education (pp. 246-259). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Spear, G. E., & Mocker, D. W. (1989). The future of adult education. In S. B. Merriam & P. M. Cunningham (Eds.), Handbook of adult and continuing education (pp. 640-649). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Stefurak, A. W. (1978). An analysis of leader behavior of selected community education coordinators in Florida (Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1977). Dissertation Abstracts International, 39, 58A.

Stevens, J. (1986). Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Stogdill, R. (1963). Manual for the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire-Form XII: An experimental revision. Columbus: The Ohio State University, College of Commerce and Administration, Bureau of Business Research.

Stogdill, R. (1970). A review of research on Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire-Form XII. Columbus: The Ohio State University, College of Administrative Science, Research in Leadership and Organizational Behavior.

Stogdill, R. (1974). Handbook of leadership. New York: The Free Press.

Taylor, S. J., & Bogdan, R. (1984). Introduction to qualitative research methods: The search for meaning. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Vroom, V. H., & Yetton, P. W. (1973). Leadership and decision-making. Pittsburgh: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Walker, D. E. (1981). The effective administrator. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Beverly Ferhn McMurtry Grissom was born June 10, 1946, in Lebanon, Kentucky, and raised in Louisville, Kentucky, where she graduated with an advanced diploma and high honors from dupont Manual High School in 1964. She earned a Bachelor of Arts degree in French and humanities from the University of Louisville in 1968 and a Master of Arts in counselor education from Western Kentucky University in 1976, graduating magna cum laude.

She taught French and English at Warren East High School in Bowling Green, Kentucky and spent four years employed in the Louisville, Kentucky Independent School System first as a GED English teacher in federally funded street academy for economically disadvantaged inner city dropouts and later as the coordinator of adult learning centers.

Upon moving to Florida in 1975, she managed and taught in an individualized adult learning center at Daytona Beach Community College, becoming the program administrator in 1977. In 1981, she was named the college's Director of Special Programs and, in 1982, its Director of Adult Education. She was promoted to the college's Dean of Adult Education in

1989 and named its Dean of Adult and Lifelong Learning in 1990. In 1994, she was appointed to the position of Dean of the West Campus.

An active leader in both civic and professional associations, she has been president and/or board member of several civic and professional associations at the local, state, and national levels. She has been honored with several local, state, and national civic and professional leadership awards. She is regularly invited speaker and consultant to various civic, business, and professional groups.

A resident of Ormond Beach, Florida, Ms. Grissom is the proud mother of Tammaye Vanece Grissom, also a University of Florida alumna.

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Education.

James W. Hensel, Chairman
Professor of Educational Leadership

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Education.

Carl E. Beeman
Professor of Agricultural Education
and Communication

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Education.

David S. Honeyman
Associate Professor of Educational
Leadership

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Education.

Emmett L. Williams
Professor Emeritus of Instruction and
Curriculum

This dissertation was submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the College of Education and to the Graduate School and was accepted as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education.

August, 1994

David E. Smith
Dean, College of Education

Dean, Graduate School